

EXECUTIVE STUDY COMMISSION ON THE
MARYLAND FIRE AND RESCUE INSTITUTE

S. G. Fred Frederick
President
Fred Frederick Chrysler
43 Washington Boulevard
Laurel 20707
Phone: 776-7373 (D.C.)
792-7972 (Balto)

CHAIRMAN
General Public

Thomas A. Mattingly
P.O. Box 173
Leonardtwn 20650
Phone: 475-7700

President of MD State
Firemen's Association

Chief Peter J. O'Connor
Baltimore City Fire Department
410 East Lexington Street
Baltimore 21202
Phone: 396-3083

Chairman of MD Metropolitan
Fire Chiefs

Leonard T. King
6047 Melbourne Avenue
Deale 20751
Phone: 867-3658

President of MD Chiefs
Association

Lawrence L. Preston
1598 Native Dancer Court
Annapolis 21401
Phone: 856-2940

Chairman of Council of
Fire Academies

Ronald W. Milor
Prince George's County Fire
Department
3106 Mitchellville Road
Bowie 20716
Phone: 249-2454

President of MD State & D.C.
Professional Fire Fighters
Association

Kevin B. O'Connor
Baltimore County Fire Department
800 N. York Road
Towson 21204
Phone: 296-0120

Career Fire Service
Representative

Md.
Y 3.
Fi 52
:2/F
/990-

RECEIVED

SEP 4 1991

MD. STATE LAW LIBRARY

Contact - Brian Dermody - 405-1990

Md. Y 3. Fi 52 :2/F /990-
Executive Study Commission
on the Maryland Fire and
Minutes

Charles F. Sturtz
Vice President
Administrative Affairs
University of Maryland at
College Park
1132 Main Administration Bldg.
College Park 20742
Phone: 405-1108

Representative of President
of University of Maryland
College Park

Honorable William H. Amoss
Senate of Maryland
307 Senate Office Building
Annapolis 21401
Phone: 841-3603/879-7272

Member of the Senate
Nominated by President

Honorable Robert J. DiPietro
Maryland House of Delegates
219 House Office Building
Annapolis 21401
Phone: 841-3205/498-8640

Member of the House of
Delegates Nominated by the
Speaker

J. Donald Mooney
3313 Ryerson Circle
Lansdowne 21227
Phone: 242-7713

Volunteer Fire and Rescue
Service Representative

Robert H. Shimer
204 Howard Street
Westernport 21562
Phone: 791-4758

Volunteer Fire and Rescue
Service Representative

Honorable Joseph R. Robison
Mayor
City of Laurel
350 Municipal Square
Laurel 20707
Phone: 725-5300

Volunteer Fire and Rescue
Service Representative

Stephan D. Cox
5 North Kelly Avenue
Bel Air 21014
Phone: 879-8701/934-2600

Volunteer Fire and Rescue
Service Representative

Secretary Charles L. Benton
Department of Budget and
Fiscal Planning
4th Floor
L.L. Goldstein Treasury Bldg.
Annapolis 21401
Phone: 974-2114

Secretary of DBFP
Ex-Officio

Frederick E. Porter
Staff Specialist
Fire-Rescue Education and
Training Commission
MD Higher Education Commission
16 Francis Street
Annapolis 21401
Phone: 974-2971

Rep of MHEC
Ex-Officio

Rocco J. Gabriele
State Fire Marshall
Suite 314
6776 Reisterstown Road
Baltimore 21215
Phone: 764-4324

MD State Fire Marshall
Ex-Officio

September 19, 1990

CORRECTED

Minutes of MFRI Study Commission Meeting
October 10, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 am October 10, 1990 in the Main Office of MFRI, Berywn Heights, MD.

In attendance were: - S.G. Fred Frederick, Thomas A. Mattingly, Peter J. O'Connor, Leonard T. King, Lawrence L. Preston, Ronald W. Milor, Kevin B. O'Connor, Charles F. Sturtz, J. Donald Mooney, Robert H. Shimer, the Honorable Joseph R. Robison, Stephen D. Cox, Mr. Edward Quinn representing Secretary Benton, Frederick E. Porter, Rocco J. Gabriele, and the Honorable Robert J. DiPietro.

Chairman Frederick opened the meeting by outlining the Governor's Executive Order and the fact he generally does not accept procrastination. The November 15 preliminary report and the December 15 final report dates must be met.

Discussion of MFRI history and problems

Del. DiPietro noted that there have been and are critical problem at MFRI (goes back very long possibly as long as 20 years). This is not a poor reflection on employees of MFRI or volunteer/career fire rescue service. The agency is slipping possibly due to some inattention of the University and the fact that MFRI accountability seems to be in question. MFRI needs more money. We are now starting on a "fresh foot" with all interested parties "at the table." Two major reports have shown serious problems at MFRI over the years, the situation has grown progressively worse.

Mr. Sturtz provided considerable detail on the substance of internal review which has been provided in Administrative Review report to President Kirwan, a periodic review of UMCP academic units is a normal procedure.

President Kirwan formed the MFRI administrative review group in 1988 - it included fire service representatives.

- review had three parts
 - 1) organizational self-study, an internal review - generated a substantial number of recommendations
 - 2) external review group - that report is attached to Mr. Sturtz's letter
 - 3) panel of three outside experts
- recommendations for action are contained in the report

The report identifies 5 principal issues,

- 1) Role and mission - MFRI has no operational plan - there are serious omissions in its legislative mandate, for example, regional training centers, research activities
- 2) Governance structure - MFRI overwhelmed by the number of advisory bodies as Del. DiPietro said "too many cooks stirring the pot."
 - Director Hoglund captured by these forces pulled in different directions by everybody's whims
 - MFRI needs one advisory body as a focal point
- 3) Oversight - President Kirwan, UMCP, can't spend time needed to do the job right.
- 4) MFRI administration - can't have "a warm fuzzy feeling" about situation - effective administration is not very evident
 - it is, in fact, seriously deficient
 - Director Hoglund used to spend 90% of this time "in the field," has cut back to 2/3 of time away from office.
 - MFRI Director should not be doing that kind of outreach
- 5) Finances - no recommendation for additional funding
 - This administrative review validates previous report (73?)
 - That report did not lead to effective action

Should MFRI Remain at UMCP or be relocated

Considerable discussion ensued as to whether MFRI should remain with the University, go under Dept. of Public Safety, or become an independent state agency. Discussion continued on the following issues: MFRI can't stay under UMCP unless the University is prepared to say everything will be straightened out; some didn't like idea of placement in Dept. of Corrections, would be a stepchild agency like MSFMO is; Del. DiPietro met with the Governor and he liked the idea of MFRI as an independent agency; the transfer bill met with much resistance - much of it unfounded; Del. DiPietro commented that he was willing to listen to a better method if anyone has one.

Mr. Sturtz commented on the following issues

- If MFRI stays with the University it will be moved
- liaison position created to bridge gap
- If the recommendations of the current admin.

review are not implemented then MFRI must "fold its tent" at the University

Kevin O'Connor asked: Does University want MFRI? Mr. Sturtz responded in the affirmative and noted that President Kirwan did not act on the administrative review because legislative issue delayed actions. Mr. Sturtz noted that the University is prepared to retain MFRI and probably house it in the College of Engineering. This would be the best department because:

- 1) long term association which ruptured in mid 70's
- 2) has outreach programs - technical assistance programs
- 3) has good reputation for management
- 4) proposed MFRI research agenda most closely connected with Engineering Department

The University is prepared to keep MFRI and support it. President Kirwan concerned administrative review has been on table over a year. He is troubled because it appears the University is not doing anything.

Kevin O'Connor inquired as to why the recommendation for new board of advisors slight career element? Mr. Sturtz replied that the intention was to get broad based representation on board. Joe Robison commented that that issue generated more hostility towards MFRI legislations than any other issue.

The chairman reminded the commission memmmbers to please speak to the issue but don't debate it - don't "get off track." He encouraged all to do their homework, he noted that meetings will last only 90 minutes - if we can't do them in 90 minutes then the Governor picked the wrong people.

Tom Mattingly asked Mr. Sturtz if he felt MFRI will work well if it stays at UMCP? Mr. Sturtz felt that it would, although it will require effective leadership. He also noted that

- at UMCP units are decentralized
- department chairs are very important - vested with much authority and responsibility
- MFRI can't function well due to myriad influences

Mr. Sturtz was asked, "Will Dr. Kirwan give time frame for changes?" He replied, "Yes - he will clearly set a time frame." He also noted that

- Dr. Kirwan is somewhat chagrined at the delay - he has been waiting on other actions.

Mr. Mooney inquired of Mr. Sturtz: President Kirwan is very impressive - but is the College of Engineering receptive to accepting MFRI back? Are we going to get this recommendation from Dr. Kirwan? Mr. Sturtz replied that Dr. George Dieter, Dean College of Engineering, indicated to Dr. Kirwan that he is receptive to accepting MFRI.

Ted Porter asked Mr. Sturtz: "Has the University considered any decentralized alternatives for MFRI?" (move off UMCP campus) Mr. Sturtz replied: "No - University has not looked at alternative which would MFRI off of campus." He also noted:

- UM System administration is to be reduced
- UM System is getting out of service activities
- have not considered other campuses

Ted Porter stated that he recommended the University (or commission?) do so. The Chair confirmed

Del. DiPietro noted that Dr. Kirwan is not being criticized for inaction, in fact, he has been advised to stay out of problem because this needs a consensus group to figure out.

- if MFRI has not worked well placed in President's office why will it work well at dept. level?
- We need a response from Dr. Kirwan

Three minute closing remarks

The following remarks were made by various members of the commission in attendance. They have been recreated here for information purposes with the respective speakers identified.

Tom Mattingly

- Like to see response from Dr. Kirwan
 - concerns of MFRI employees should be aired by their representative(s)
 - believe December 15 deadline will cause us to rush
 - MFRI employees requested we make deadline so they aren't "kept hanging."
- I see three possible outcomes
- 1) MFRI stays at UMCP administrative review addressed
 - 2) if MFRI moved consider MFRETC as alternative oversight body
 - 3) develop completely new state agency ex. Department of Emergency Services
- I am not sure which outcome would be best

Leonard King

- Creating a new emergency service agency not a new idea - I endorse it

- it could contain MFRI, MIEMSS, MSFMO, and other agencies
- MSFMO seems to be a stepchild in present organization
- commission time frame too tight
- I want to hear from leader of agencies or UM departments that want MFRI

I am open minded about outcome

Rocco Gabrile

I am neutral on this issue because of my position in the Dept. of Public Safety

- I'm here to offer advice only

Robert Shimer

- Main concern to get MFRI back to previous level of national leadership
- must be aggressive in development of new training programs
- there is currently stagnation in this area
- regional training centers need help
- open minded to ultimate placement of MFRI
- must meet needs of total fire service in state
- MFRI is being pulled apart by different advisory councils
- great frustration over capital expenditure delays - seems it will take a lifetime to see results at regional training center

Don Mooney

- I made motion to pursue moving MFRI away from UMCP
- now I'm not sure of my position
- I was a product of the FSE training program 30 years ago - MFRI is no longer on top (of list of state training programs) - Why?
- Obviously money is not a problem
- The University has not given MFRI a fair shake
- Hopefully we will hear from all levels of University leadership that the University wants to keep MFRI

Mr. Sturtz

- MFRI has a \$3,480,000 annual budget
- University chose options to (do study of MFRI and) expose problems
- MFRI employees are almost universally regarded as good

- people
- MFRI has serious administrative and management problems
- University appoints heads for different campus units, and as has been apparent in our athletic programs, if one person does not succeed, we get someone else
- administrative problems can be corrected
- No preconceived opinions regarding funding issue?

Chief O'Connor (Metro Chief)

- There is in Maryland an integrated fire-rescue service; combinations of volunteer and career personnel
- great concern that MFRI legislation left career people out. This was corrected I hope. I have an open mind about
- Some chiefs are in favor of relocating MFRI, others are opposed

Kevin O'Connor

- I was a primary opponent of the MFRI relocation bill
- I want MFRI restored to position of national prominence
- I am delighted to hear of Dr. Kirwan's position

Ted Porter

I am here representing the MHEC; here as a resource person - I am neutral; I wait on direction from MFRETC which has recognized problems at MFRI for a long time
1975 - Governor's Study of Fire Service - this report highlighted similar problems, report available.

- There is a generic problem in fire service training - most fire rescue service personnel are volunteers - the state does not provide these services but has major responsibility for training.
- Support functions for fire rescue service are in different agencies
- viewed as unwanted and neglected stepchild
- fire service needs a single parent agency
- fire service needs focus point
- this problem is not inherent to MFRI, it is apparent all over the state

Chair

- We will give Governor a report, hopefully on time
- keep in touch with me through Mr. Darmody - I'll coordinate

Ron Milor

I agree with others
I'm open minded
Let's do what's right for educational needs of fire service

Larry Preston

- Fire chiefs set policy for career depts. - they tell academy director positions
- I'm neutral on this issue at this time
- Only interested in quality fire rescue service training

Steve Cox

- Quality of fire service training probably my main concern
- I'm also a full time faculty member of MFRI
- I'm open minded
- Goal to determine proper location of MFRI so that it can provide best service to users

Joe Robison

- I was on Governor's Fire Service Comm 73-74
- Same issues discussed then
- Resulted in creation of MFRI in 1976
- '77 Pres. Board of Advisors set up - I was charter member and still serve on Board
- The Board of Advisors does not run MFRI
- Administrative Review well documented
- it is thorough and fair
- I served in the review process also
- I respect people that did study very highly
- notes page 1
- drift toward failure
- I'm not open minded (about MFRI/UM) MFRI should find another home
- The University has screwed with it for 20 years
- When I heard the College of Engineering mentioned I thought "What has MFRI done to deserve this?"
- The best position for MFRI would be an independent agency reporting to the Governor

Del. DiPietro

nothing more to say

Rocco Gabriel

The mandate for MFRI is not in the legislation that created it. It needs a mission statement.

Chair

Commission can only address organization and structure

Mr. Sturtz

We can provide a draft mission statement to the commission

Tom Mattingly

It is important to be able to identify MFRI budget within University budget. MFRI is competing with entire campus. Is it possible to remove competition by creating separate agency?

Ed Quinn (in response)

The problem would be worse. MFRI would then be in competition with entire state (all state government agencies)

Tom Mattingly

The MSFA has been the lobbying unit for MFRI

Mr. Sturtz

I will provide a copy of MFRI's budget to the Commission.

Mr. Sturtz then drew outline of University budget on blackboard. The formal budget request does not have MFRI's budget included. The University's overall budget is divided into restricted (\$350M) and unrestricted (\$70M) categories. Unrestricted funds are divided into program areas, ex., instruction, academic support, operating expenses. No individual organization is identified. There is a budget for MFRI: 1) budget request, asking budget, and 2) working budget, this shows account balances.

Ed Quinn

The basic appropriations of state government met national standards for government financing

Tom Mattingly

MIEMSS gets grant money. Does MFRI? MFRI has had severe budget cuts; these were taken out of instructor salaries, this cuts at the heart of MFRI programs. Shortage of operating funds for regional training centers, MFRI has had to beg, borrow and steal to keep centers on track. Budget not responsive to needs. MFRI people can do the job, most capable people in country, most of them.

Don Mooney

Many capable people leaving ship. This is a major problem. There are 7 faculty openings at this time. Key people have been lost.

Del. DiPietro

Commission needs a budget presentation including audit report.

Leonard King

Where does MFRI contract money go to?

Mr. Sturtz

MFRI keeps all of its money. University does not tax MFRI like it does other self supporting units on campus. University is required to assess these other units for 3-1/2% of their contract money. This is a cooperative training program. MFRI has campus utilities paid for by University - does share costs of utilities for Main Office in Berwyn Heights. Not aware of any sponsored research grants (in response to Tom Mattingly).

Joe Robison

For the record - a Dec. 8, 1989 meeting was scheduled with the Governor, Del. Eileen Rehrman, myself in Annapolis. This meeting was canceled due to snow. Another was then scheduled with Governor and staff and Delegates Rehrman, DiPietro. At this meeting on Jan. 25, the Governor suggested a study commission on MFRI's location was not needed, instead legislation to create a separate agency should be introduced as soon as possible. The Governor pushed this idea forward.

Kevin O'Connor

Has MFRI actively pursued research grants?

Mr. Sturtz

No

The Chair summed up the meeting with the following points: Each Commission member is requested to furnish the top ten hot items in their opinion the Commission needs to address and place in their order of priority by October 17. We need to get on-track to meet our deadlines. Phone number for Brian Darmod is 301-405-1990, if you need questions researched. We will review every Commissioner's list and then report to the full Commission. The next meeting will be at MFRI's main office building on Tuesday, October 23, at 1:00 p.m. Please do your homework before arriving.

Call Brian Darmody for information. We will meet time constraints of the Governor. He is the last guy I want to upset.

Minutes of MFRI Study Commission Meeting
October 23, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. with a quorum present. Present were: Rocco Gabriel, Steve Cox, Tom Mattingly, Fred Frederick, Kevin O'Connor, Larry Preston, Ed Quinn, representing Charles Benton, Bob Shimer, Leonard King, Joe Robison, Ted Porter, Don Mooney, Robert DiPietro, Charles Sturtz, and Brian Darmody. Guests present were: R.B. Wright, Anne Osner, Bev Ness, Mark Down, Mainer Smith, and Tom Wilson.

The following items were passed out: the top ten hot items of each member, the MFRI budget and the Draft MFRI Plan of Organization.

Corrections to the minutes were made, with Brian Darmody receiving the corrections. Moved and accepted as moved as printed and modified -motion carried.

Report on letter received by Chair from a Donavon & Associates, Joseph L. Donavon from Walkersville, MD - past Director Massachusetts Fire Fighting Academy for four years offered to appear and testify. His letter will be circulated to the Commission. Mr. Gabriel noted that Joe Donavon wanted to offer alternative as to what they did in Massachusetts.

Top Ten Priority Items

Chair has response from 10 people. (It was noted that he had received 11 responses.) He would like to know if anyone has any questions of Mr. Sturtz that may be ones they have had since last meeting. Also address any questions you may have from last meeting to Del. DiPietro.

Steve Cox

Not pertaining to the last meeting, I have a question about some correspondence I received. I understand that the Commission has a meeting this evening?

Joe Robison

No, let me explain that. I met at a political meeting the other day and asked him if he would get together the local groups Savage, Clarksville, Elkridge set a date for tonight. It is not a commission meeting and I'm sorry for the misunderstanding.

Steve Cox

My main concern is the letter I received which is on Savage Volunteer Fire Co., Inc. letterhead and it specifically says the Task Force will explain the problem and will be available to answer any questions or listen to comments. I didn't realize that we had come to the conclusion of the problem yet. This was dated October 9 which was the day before our previous meeting.

Chair

I know of no meetings, I know of no subcommittees of this commission and if there is such, you will be informed, no one has any authorization to communicate with anybody, if you have a problem with Mayor Robison or the Savage Fire Dept., and it involves this Commission, I would appreciate it if you'd let me know. Only person who will have this information is the Governor.

Chair

Are there any other questions with respect to our previous meeting? Any statements that anybody feels that would like to make to clarify.

Don Mooney

Are we going to hear testimony from outside individuals?

Chair

This Commission would have to make this decision and I'll address that later on. I would like to have you elaborate a little further -- if you feel we should and why you feel we should.

Don Mooney

Well, I don't have a problem one way or another, but I know there are people outside who want to speak before us. I know one individual -- we're getting bombarded. I feel this is very important thing we're doing and we're going to be affecting the training situation in this State into the next century and beyond. I'd like to know how others feel about this. I think there is probably some expertise out there that we should hear, but I'm not sure.

Tom Mattingly

Comment you made a few minutes ago about report going back to the Governor. I suggest at some point in time that it would be beneficial to the Task Force and to the charge that the Task

Force has had to distribute some type of a report, maybe not the full report that goes to the Governor, as to the findings of the Commission to the fire service as a whole. For information purposes. Should aid in the way the report is perceived by the fire service.

Kevin O'Connor

To elaborate on what Don said, I was wondering if Mr. Hoglund would be coming before the Commission to testify in any manner?

Chair

That's a good point. My question to you is: shall we have outside testimony and what I would do in this case, is advise those interested people, that we would receive testimony one evening where anybody that would like to speak to this commission would have the opportunity to address the Commission in a three or four minute presentation.

Kevin O'Connor

No problem with that but I was gearing my comments to having people that actually deal with the Institute, in terms of John Hoglund, or people that prepare some of these reports that come in. Specifically, when I brought up Mr. Hoglund, a lot of the testimony that we read seemed to allude to problems with the management of the Institute. I'd like him to respond to some of these comments.

Chair

Do you feel that it serves a purpose, and when you open this up to the public, we're going to listen to everyone who wants to speak.

Mr. Sturtz

I would encourage you to have an open forum like that. One of the things we discovered as we went through the administrative review and opened the door for lots of people to come in. There are a lot of opinions and ideas and suggestions. I think it would be Commission to hear those. So I would support having that kind of open forum. I've also talked with Dr. Kirwan, I think he would like to come to meet with the Commission. You can decide to that as a meeting like this as opposed to a public meeting. That would probably be wise, because I think he'd like to spend some time talking with the Commission so he is thinking about doing that, he's prepared and would like to do it. I would also support the larger public hearing.

Steve Cox

I agree. I think we need to get as much input as we can. Mr. King and I were just talking -- limit it to 3 minutes and open it up.

Leonard King

I'd like to see it to gather additional information. So I'll make a motion of 3 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for organizations to speak -- One night only -- for our peace of mind.

Ted Porter

I would also agree with Mr. Sturtz that it is important that we do hear from the President and other individuals but not at a public forum. They should be invited to this, i.e. the Commission.

Chair

Does anyone else wish to speak to this issue.

Ed Quinn

I don't understand, when you say this would be 3 to 5 minutes, would this be an open forum where they can pick up anything they want or do you try to steer it to a specific issue at hand?

Chair

If it's a public forum, you're going to listen to whatever they got they want to tell you.

Joe Robison

I think the idea is excellent but there is one thing -- if the forum is going to help someone make up their mind or broaden their scope that's one thing, but if all their going to do is have a forum for people to talk to and they've already made up their mind, why have a forum.

Chair

Anybody else want to speak to that issue. My proposal would be, if we choose to have it, that we have it at the University at some auditorium, that we have a meeting prior to the public forum where we would invite Dr. Kirwan, Executive Director, and anyone else that you feel that you would like to question. We would do

that all at that time. We would have dinner between the first meeting and the public meeting. At the public meeting better plan to stay late. If we're going to open it we're going to open it and have it fair to everybody. Is there a motion that we proceed. Motion made, seconded.

Robert DiPietro

We have an interim report due to the Governor November 15. Are we going to do the public forum before or after the Interim Report.

Chair

Before the Interim Report. Any other discussion on the motion? Motion carried unanimously.

The next order of business is the distribution of a report to the Fire Service. Mr. Mattingly do you wish to expand on that?

Tom Mattingly

Only that I think that last year that was one of the problems that was created by the introduction of the bill with the lack of time to distribute it so that people could see it and make comments. I think it would be to our advantage, especially if there will be some kind of legislative initiative that the fire service be aware of what will be proposed prior to it going to Annapolis. That would allow for some other comment if they would want comment on it. I think it has to be very open to the fire service in order for it to be successful.

Chair

Does anyone want to speak to that issue as to whether you favor that type of report or whether at what time we should consider circulating such a report if we do circulate it.

Tom Mattingly

It would depend on the Governor's concurrence as to whether it would be circulated or not.

Don Mooney

That's the only question I have. We in the fire service realize that this type of thing subsides over time with good information.

Chair

I will rely on the Governor's advice as to how to handle this.

The next order of business -- I'm going to ask each of you to comment on pros and cons as you see them today -- this doesn't mean that you can't change your mind between now and the next meeting. This only is a process to provide food for thought for everybody who is going to help us arrive at a decision.

1st subject: should MFRI stay within the University or out of the University?

Brian Darmody

Make a comment -- I received the ten top items -- there was a range of suggestions. One of the issues that came up was do we need legislation -- there's a range of options on the governance issue which is where does MFRI fit into State government; starting from the status quo -- some members of the Commission went to the other end which would be the independent fire services agencies. There's a range of options between the status quo and that range. Another point is: question was if it stays within the University do you need legislation? Keep in mind you're probably going to need legislation in any case. Right now by statute MFRI reports to the President. If the sense of the Commission was that it should be moved to the College of Education for example you'll probably need legislation regardless of which option you choose, unless you just keep the status quo.

There is a wide range of options available: staying with the University system, becoming a quasi independent agency that contracts out much of its work, being absorbed into another state agency, or possibly becoming a completely separate state agency.

Chair

Does anyone feel that there should be any other options presented.

Considerable discussion then ensued based on whether or not MFRI should stay within the University of Maryland College Park, preferably within the College of Engineering. (As opposed to its present location of reporting to the President's office.) There was definitely strong feelings by some members of the Commission that MFRI would benefit from location with the College of Engineering (if not moved out of University). One of MFRI's problems has been one of accountability. There is also the benefit for research capabilities. Interaction with other departments at the University is probably beneficial to both MFRI

and MFRI employees. However, if MFRI stays in the University, there must be a strong commitment from the University to support MFRI and to address the problems that have been identified through the administrative review and other processes through the years. It was noted that many key personnel have already left MFRI, the possibility of losing additional key personnel over benefit of other changes is a real concern.

The discussion also included the issue of MFRI joining with other emergency services or becoming a stand-alone agency. The feeling of some members was quite strong regarding this issue. They felt that all emergency services under one head will aid in emergency services benefiting across the board. Also concern was expressed over MFRI being under any institution: it would become a stepchild in any agency including the University. It was noted that currently there is a fragmentation within emergency services. Basically have emergency services and training under one roof, preferably as a stand alone agency. Understanding from the Attorney General was that if MFRI became a stand alone agency, current benefits enjoyed by employees could be transferred. Feeling was that if MFRI went into any agency that agency would need to be an agency that is flexible and willing to support MFRI.

It was noted that the only state in the area that spends more money on training is the State of New York at \$5M. That \$5M all comes out of the general fund. University of Maryland spends \$3.4M the next state to that is Texas at \$2.8M, of this amount \$2M comes from the students that train there.

Donald Mooney noted that MFRI battles have been fought for the last 25 years. Battles over employee salaries, then over other budget items. Has been a continual battle over MFRI's budget. He wonders if the budget problems can ever be straightened out and he is really confused on this issue. Ed Quinn noted that he was not settled on this issue. I'm not sure that its the purview of this Commission to tell the Governor to move it to another agency, until that time, I haven't heard anything that says it shouldn't be under the University, I'm not sure there's anything better out there.

Ted Porter noted that the first thing that has to be done is to identify the problem, just moving MFRI to another agency or stand-alone status does not identify the problem. MFRI has a weak internal administrative structure He feels that with a strong aggressive administrative structure MFRI would be able to continue regardless of its location, i.e., within the University, within another state agency or as a stand-alone agency. First objective should be to look at the internal management structure of the institute and make recommendations to the Governor for strengthening that.

Chair

I have a couple of questions. Understand that I am not on one side of this issue or the other and I am not privy to the experience that this Commission has on this subject. I'm learning a great deal and reading a lot. It looks to me like there is no sting of accountability in the system today where whoever is being served by the system or responsible for the system can go to that individual and fix it right now. Is there any assurance on the part of the University that this system would not fall in the same category that other systems within the University fall in and I guess I'm speaking of the length of time it takes to fix a problem that exists when you're dealing with officials of the University with tenure, is there a fix for that type of thing, is there a solution in that area?

Charles Sturtz

Let me respond in a couple of ways to your questions. I think clearly, the University is a people based business. Any time we're more reliant on people than we are on structure and bureaucracy we run a greater risk of not addressing problems and failures. A University that has a problem in a department or center it will drift on longer perhaps than it would in any other kind of enterprise. That is a reality. Tenure should not enter into the question of leadership and direction of the institute. It does not in this case, at present. People who are Directors don't have tenure, they are "at pleasure" appointments. That kind of structure can exist for MFRI as it does for other agencies. I think MFRI's top 3 people do not have the protection of tenure. I may be wrong but I think that's true.

The accountability problem within the University goes back to whenever the decision was made to locate this in the Office of the President. There simply not a President, I don't believe, who will have the time or inclination to pay attention to an operational entity such as MFRI. We run institutes and centers and there are a lot of them on the College Park campus. They almost all run out of the College of this or College of that. They are assigned within the normal academic structure for control and direction. I don't know why MFRI was brought out of Engineering, I've only been at the University 8 years, and really only had anything to do with MFRI as part of this review. I am not at all an expert on the history of MFRI. The most important resource of MFRI has to be its training complement. If that complement is misled, or misdirected or misinformed, not properly coached, or doesn't have the kind of orientation for the training program, then the agency is not going to be successful. I agree with Ted, I believe the conclusion of our study says that this agency is organizationally drifting to ineffectiveness and inefficiency. That's a leadership issue. That is not an issue of the quality of the training program, but it can lead to that,

because if you're not paying attention to it than that program falls apart as well. The University can deal with people problems, it tends to deal with people problems less rapidly than you would deal with them elsewhere. The higher it goes up in the structure of a University, typically, the less likely we are to deal efficiently with the people problems. This happens to be at the highest level, it's in the Office of the President.

Chair

Is there someone who can speak on exactly who we serve and where they're located. Who are the users of MFRI and where do they come from?

All of us can speak to that. They come from all over the state, the smallest part of the volunteer in small communities right straight to the City of Baltimore or the big counties of Prince George's, Montgomery, Baltimore, Howard and Anne Arundel. The largest group of users is the volunteer fire service and the rural volunteer fire service in the state. The larger fire services do not require as much support from MFRI as the smaller services, although the majority of training for all volunteers of the state is provided by MFRI. It was requested that some numbers be provided.

Charles Sturtz

In 1989 the fire fighter population was estimated at 38,000. The number of fire fighters enrolled in MFRI courses in 1989 was 13,000. Roughly 1 in 3 was enrolled in that year. About 10,500 of that enrollment completed the course in which they were enrolled, so they have an attrition rate of something less than 20%. They offer 900 courses and they conducted 21,000 instruction hours. That gives you some of the magnitudes. The report indicates that MFRI spends about \$200 for each student enrolled in those courses. The national average was about \$100. The 21,000 hours of instruction produced 310,000 student instruction hours.

It was requested if there were more of those types of numbers available? Del. DiPietro asked who the people are who are in these programs and who the University of Maryland is paying for through MFRI versus whose being paid for through these other academies, whose getting this money, and where is the money coming from?

Considerable discussion on where the numbers came from and how MFRI and the Fire Academies differ, and funding for MFRI. Where are the people from? How much does each county spend on fire training? Who are the user groups of MFRI? Is there a duplication of effort on the part of the academies and MFRI?

Where do MFRI clients come from and should they be trained at MFRI or at their academies within their own counties? Does MFRI do additional training that is not available at Fire Academies? i.e., industrial uses, etc. How much are the local jurisdictions paying for MFRI instruction? Is there a fee schedule for MFRI training? Does MFRI have an income? Where can we find the information on MFRI's budget and income and the breakdown?

Discussion continued on the issue of firefighters becoming certified and the taking of courses to have that information on their resumes for promotion purposes.

Chair

Like to settle on a date for the public hearing. After considerable discussion date was determined to be Wednesday, November 7, 1990 at 7:00 pm. Have meeting at 4:00 pm and have 2 hours set aside to hear from Dr. Kirwan, Mr. Hoglund, and anyone else you want to hear from. It was determined that only Dr. Kirwan and Mr. Hoglund, would need to attend the Commission meeting and all others attend the public hearing. Discussion on how to get word out on the public hearing. Is there anyone in the public sector not represented at the Commission who should be notified. I want everyone to be notified so that they don't come back and say we didn't know.

There was additional discussion on MFRI budget and could it be submitted separately, i.e., independently of the University.

Commission will not answer questions at the hearing.

Chair

Appreciate your prompt attendance. Passed out previous report. Meeting adjourned at 1430.

MINUTES OF THE MFRI COMMISSION

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ 1990

NOVEMBER 7, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m., with a quorum present. Present were: S.G. Fred Frederick, Chair; Steve Cox; Larry Preston; Kevin O'Connor; Charles Sturtz; Bob Shimer; Ed Quinn, representing Charles Benton; Don Mooney; Ronald Milor, Joe Robison; Tom Mattingly; Leonard King; Ted Porter; and Peter O'Connor. Guests present were: John Gatton, Jr., Robert Wright, Danny Davis, William Cook, Brian Darmody.

Several items were passed out: a report on the industrial-training program, copy of Donovan letter, Maley Commission report and a letter from the Hagerstown Volunteer Fire Department.

Both corrected minutes of 10/10 meeting and minutes of 10/23 meeting were approved.

The Chair noted that at the last meeting Mr. Hoglund of MFRI and Dr. Kirwan from UMCP had been invited to speak to the commission. Mr. Hoglund was introduced and seated. Chair noted that he would entertain any approach that Mr. Hoglund was comfortable with, i.e., either report first and field questions, or start with fielding questions.

Mr. Hoglund stated that he would prefer the former. In that light he said that he'd like to thank each member of the commission for the invitation to be here today and would attempt to be of service in one way or another to the Commission. Mr. Hoglund then proceeded to give some background of his experience, more than 25 years at the University of Maryland, 20 of those years as the Director of MFRI. Joined the faculty of the University in 1963. Mr. Hoglund also provided some background information on the University of Maryland and MFRI. In service training has been offered within the State of Maryland for 60 years. Training has been provided by MFRI since 1975, Fire Service Extension Dept. in the College of Engineering, 1937-1975, and the Fire College from 1930-1937. He went on to discuss new facilities and growth of MFRI over the last several years.

Chair noted that he appreciated Mr. Hoglund's comments and was sure that there would be questions. He stated that he wanted the Commission to feel that they were permitted to ask any question that they wanted of Mr. Hoglund and hoped that he would not be upset if it was a question that might be a little tough.

Larry Preston

You have had the opportunity to travel throughout North America and view training agencies, this is very subjective, but have you seen a general decline in the esteem that the Maryland system is held in through other systems? If so, what would you attribute any decline if it should be present?

Mr. Hoglund

I am going to be very honest and frank, and I'm only going to deal with facts. There are politics within fire service education and training at all levels, the same as there are within the operational fire service. I have not registered until recent months, any decline or loss of imagery, by the outside. Until the past 18-22 months there has been no references to the confusion which exists in Maryland today.

Tom Mattingly

We were presented a copy of the Administrative Study of State Training Programs, as part of Commission material. It has been mentioned for a period of time that Maryland's program was not included in this report. These things range from very elaborate and expensive programs to very piecemeal programs throughout the country. Where do you sit us fitting in and would you have any objections to taking and responding to the questions that were asked in this study and give us some feedback on where you feel MFRI really fits in. Maybe take this study, review it, and answer the questions that were posed to other training academies across the country.

Mr. Hoglund

I want you to be aware that other jurisdictions are using the University of Maryland as the prototype to lift up the program from which that study came. There are some "feelings" normally referred to as "hard feelings" in light of that being an example of the past. I would not move to that program.

Mr. Mattingly

This study gives us a lot of data, including average cost for training, budgets, salaries, possibly already been addressed in the administrative review but it would be nice to compare Maryland's figures to other state programs. To see what it's costing us per student, etc.

Mr. Hoglund

I'd like to respond to that. First, if memory serves me, that survey began in light of salaries attempting to direct attention that other salaries were more outstanding within the country than those of the writer and the institution represented. Secondly, I'd like to respond in light of the University of Maryland's operation. Some areas of MFRI operation cost more because you have asked for it.

Mr. Quinn

Where do you see MFRI sitting - from your perspective - does it belong in the University of Maryland or elsewhere, I think I know where you're going to come from but I'd rather hear you say it and why. What would be the advantages and disadvantages to placing it in some of the other areas in the state government?

Mr. Hoglund

In line with some of the changes that have been made and some of the things I have heard, I think it would be difficult for the State of Maryland to address the costs associated with the movement of its State Fire and Rescue Training Program at this point in time. Housing it within an institution of learning places it on the cutting edge of changes, including the fire community. If you're asking if it would be better here or there, I am only saying what institutions are and what we have here, I really can't compare the differences.

Chair

Maryland Fire Service would like to take pictures during these proceedings if anyone has no objections.

Don Mooney

Two things John, do you have any personal misgivings about the administrative review; any particular areas that you might disagree with the findings?

Mr. Hoglund

Has the process been shared with this Commission?

Don Mooney

The process has yes.

Mr. Hoglund

The particular process was conducted with the highest order of ethics and most professional manner. Charles Sturtz was steering committee chairperson and with insight he brought to the process was entirely different than when it started off. He got the train back on the track and with that the steering committee, the internal review committee, and all other committees set up. University's process will probably be used as a prototype for other institutions of higher learning. Directly to your question the answer is yes. Process does not allow you to address the problems, what went wrong and what went right. People who were being evaluated had no opportunity to address issues that were raised.

Don Mooney

MFRI's role in the Fire Service within the state has, in the past, been basic training. Am I right in my assumption? The curriculum offering, discounting the industrial area. To my feeling we have had very little advanced training. Do you see MFRI's role with the Emergency Services in the state changing?

Ted Porter

In your view as Director of the Institute, considering the systems that are available to you, what are the critical needs of the Institute to move it into the future?

Mr. Hoglund

There are modifications that must come in light of the University in the system.

1. You are putting up regional schools, developing regional schools and centers. There are operational costs associated with those entities.
2. It would be nice if there would be the ability to have budget identification. That the Institute could be identified.
3. Must have the ability to say and realize what the system is going to be able to do. There are only so many resources and with the current economy no one is going to come out of that easily. We must have agreement in what's going to be done in the certification, recertification movement. Also must have the ability to gain particular specialties within the faculty/staff pattern. We have no new positions except those through earned income.

Ted Porter

One very specific question. Legislative mandate 13-104 specifically says that the head of the Institute shall be the Director and he shall report to the President of the University of Maryland College Park. Have you been able to function in that capacity and has that direct relationship been available to you?

Mr. Hoglund

Not really. It could function better, and it has to for accountability.

Ted Porter

Have you been left alone to administer things internally, the way you see fit or have you gotten direction from other than say the President?

Mr. Hoglund

We have had in place a Management Council - 5 members currently 4 at the present time. Have been some changes made as a result of this council.

Kevin O'Connor

How would you evaluate your own performance and that of your staff and the second part of that is where you think MFRI is heading?

Mr. Hoglund

May I respond in writing to that, I have it all laid out.

Chair asked if it could be done relatively quickly, and Mr. Hoglund responded that he could after some clearance. Mr. O'Connor then asked where Mr. Hoglund personally feels MFRI should be. Chair noted that this question had been asked twice and responded to twice. Mr. O'Connor withdrew his question.

Mr. Milor had no questions.

Joe Robison

In the administrative fire service report it is noted that, 15 are higher education based, 5 are education departments whatever that means, 7 are fire marshall, 4 in public safety and 19 other. Nationally, 2/3 of the fire services are not university based. Is this a change that is recent, or is it normal, did it happen rapidly, what is the national trend?

Mr. Hoglund

Several things have had an impact within the last 15 years, community college systems added fire service training programs. Not planned well, leaders in higher education frowned on getting burned any further. Many feel that a university is not a place, in some cases, for a vocational education program such as MFRI. I can't say that there is a trend per se, it depends on the make-up of the system.

Joe Robison

You give the impression that you're carrying a large load on your shoulders, and you appeal to us, and feel that we've moved in a direction that calls for a rapid change.

Leonard King

There has been mention that MFRI might possibly move to the College of Engineering. Your at the President's Office level now, moving back to the College of Engineering, would you feel that this was a step child move, or what?

Mr. Hoglund

What modifications come with the change? What are the rules of the game? How do you take to the field and how is it going to be played? If that is established well, yes, I can speak to this. I know at this time, Dean

Dieter has brought the College to a level of national acclaim in more than one field, last I knew we were not a compatible entity.

Leonard King

With your physical location in Berwyn Heights and not College Park, do you really feel that you are a part of the University System now, outside of the benefits that you get with your paycheck?

Mr. Hoglund

I moved 1200 miles to join this place on campus, and when I got the word from the State Board of Higher Education that there wasn't going to be any construction money until 1986 or 87, I was extremely disappointed. Every time I come down on the campus it is the most non-productive time of my life.

Leonard King

With the continuing growth and every increasing changes, HAZMAT, with the complete fire rescue, ems system services in our state, do you feel that it's time maybe for emergency services of Maryland to be its proper place be created and be by themselves?

Mr. Hoglund

Can it be done?

Leonard King

I think it can be done.

Mr. Hoglund

Although we miss being able to walk across the campus to speak to the boss or enjoy the campus, our new larger facility is a plus.

Leonard King

If you were the Director, given the authority, do you have the authority now to run MFRI?

Mr. Hoglund

No I haven't had, and I don't want to be judged from 1981 through 1988 any different than that. I was Mr. Outside and we had a Mr. Inside, we had a totally different arrangement. That has since changed.

Mr. Gabriel

Everything I have read and studied tells me that MFRI is broke. Is MFRI broke? If it is how can it be fixed, and if what I'm hearing is correct that you as Director cannot hire and fire, what are you doing there as a Director?

As a manager in a state institution, I have a problem with that.

Mr. Hoglund

MFRI is not broke, it needs some lubrication, additional movement, with the administrative review being the guiding light it can be the Institute that it was. We work under a total different system within academia. We do not have the opportunity within academia to work as you do within a State agency. Academia requires a search committee process with no guarantee that the person wanted is the person hired.

Mr. Gabriel commented that he had similar requirements to hire and fire, but that they were specific guidelines. He noted that he didn't know how anyone put in that job could manage the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute, deal with personnel problems within the Institute, deliver a program that is an exceptionally good program to the fire service in the state, if he doesn't have the authority to do the things he supposed to do.

The Chair noted that Mr. Gabriel was making a speech, and asked that he please confine himself to asking questions.

Mr. Gabriel

How much pressure do you receive from outside organizations like the Maryland State Fireman's Associations and others that deal with your organization.

Mr. Hoglund

The faculty and staff live within in that particular arena. Constantly being evaluated by respective districts. Maryland is probably the most pressured area in light of state delivery systems in fire rescue and emergency medicine.

Mr. Shiner

You've indicated a couple of times about changes being made in the past 12 months, what are some of these changes?

Mr. Hoglund

We have addressed some of the smaller issues immediately within the administrative review, I would report to the Commission that there were some things underway even when Mr. Sturtz called his meetings in light of the process. There are some things that take some fiscal addressing. The operation of the Management Council has been reviewed and changes have occurred there and further changes Dr. Kirwan speaks about and will be implemented.

Mr. Shiner

What are the positions on the Management Council.

Mr. Hoglund

The positions are Assistant Director for Field Operations, Assistant Director for Special Programs, Associate Director, and the Director.

Mr. Shiner

The review comments that it is fair to conclude that taken the sum the recommendations reflect the condition of organizational drift toward serious ineffectiveness and inefficiency if not failure. Can you give me anything that you feel that might attribute to such an evaluation as this.

Mr. Hoglund

I have tried hard on that and some things that I have put into that category and worked on are the operation of a large fleet, cost of operations, computer costs, etc.

Mr. Shiner

Are you aware that the internal review (audit) originated as a result of input from your own staff?

Mr. Hoglund

No, I'm not.

Mr. Sturtz

It is a scheduled process, it was initiated by John Slaughter, I really don't know what the source of the process was. I have to say to the Commission and John Hoglund, that I admire someone who can go through that process because it's a tough one. It is not intended as a performance evaluation. There are two things that I am interested in. The notion of creating a State agency has some positive points about it if it has the potential to overcome fragmentation in the training program. John, in your sense, is there too much fragmentation in the training program for the fire service throughout the State of Maryland. MFRI is a piece of the action, it is not the largest piece of the action.

Mr. Hoglund

MFRI is only one slice of the total pie, but the pie is so fragmented at this point, you don't know what kind it is. It needs to be put under one agency.

If these leaders can come together and say together what they want it could work as a single agency.

Mr. Sturtz

As we went about the review process, nearly everyone came to us with a piece of information and a question about the information, information about everything. Why is there this persistent problem across the State in terms of information about what's going on at MFRI?

Mr. Hoglund

It's a talking point. Within the fire service community we are constantly talking. It's increasing.

Chair

Is that it. Mr. Hoglund, on behalf of this Commission, I want to extend our appreciation for your coming here and being very candid. I invite you to communicate directly with me in a personal and confidential way in regard to outside pressures that may have prevented you from doing the job as it relates to these gentlemen in this room. I'd like to have this information to share with the Governor, no names mentioned, but I think it is important.

Mr. Hoglund distributed hand outs to the Commission.

Chair

I'm sure this next gentlemen doesn't need to be introduced. He doesn't have any problems except this one. If you would open with a statement and then allow us to ask questions.

WEK

I appreciate the opportunity to come before this group, you have a very important assignment and I was hoping to have the opportunity to have some dialogue with you. I thought perhaps consistent with what you just suggested. I will make a couple of brief observations.

First, MFRI in the context of the University of Maryland College Park. The UMCP is a land grant institution with a mission that very clearly indicates it has responsibilities for teaching, research, and service, and it also has a state-wide mission it is unique in this respect. I believe that the MFRI mission is compatible with the College Park Campus. We have a variety of activities of the general type of MFRI, that is outreach service activities. My own personal view is that MFRI belongs at College Park because of our mission, various programs that exist there that interface with MFRI, because of the support services that College Park can provide to MFRI. This is not to say that all has always gone well - there are problems - they were clearly delineated in the review that was just completed. Have an excellent report, if the decision is made to leave MFRI at UMCP we will deal with the issues raised in this report.

The 1988 legislation that created UMS had very specific requirements for UMCP and its role within the system.

If in the judgement of this group that MFRI should not be in the University, we will do everything in our power to provide a smooth transition for MFRI to another location.

Ted Porter

Could you describe for me the administrative relationship between your office as the President and MFRI?

WEK

This is an area of difficulty, it was identified in the review. The unit is attached directly to the President's Office. The Director of MFRI reports to the President through a member of the University staff, not President's office, John Menard. Structurally, it is a relatively simple reporting relationship but it has difficulties.

Ted Porter

Does John Menard have any executive authority over the Institute?

WEK

He is my liaison with MFRI. He meets with John Hoglund on a regular basis, he is available to John, and keeps me informed of major issues that arise relating to MFRI.

Ted Porter

What is the role and function of the Management Council at MFRI?

WEK

The Management Council is an administrative construct that was developed some years ago to bring together the senior leadership in MFRI to oversee the management of MFRI.

Ted Porter

Does the Director report to the Management Council or does the Council report to the Director?

WEK

Structurally the Management Council is advisory to the Director. My impression is that most decisions are made as a body rather than by an individual. The Institute has a Director and the Director has the administrative authority to make decision for MFRI, he submits the budget, his name is the final sign-off on appointments, he has the statutory authority for

MFRI. He works very closely with the Management Council. This has been in operation for 3 or 4 years.

If I might add a word, because the issue of the Management Council has been raised, I think in concept it is not a sound structure. I think the problems identified with the Management Council were raised in this review and in fact a number of suggestions have been made that we get rid of the Management Council and the Management Council itself has sent me a recommendation that in light of everything, that it should be dissolved which I, in fact, have done. Very recent request, and very recently done.

Ted Porter

It is fair for me to believe in your view that the Chief Executive Officer is the Director of MFRI?

WEK

Yes.

Steve Cox

No Questions

Don Mooney

Do you have a time frame that you would think that these things would be reviewed by you and implemented if this Commission decides it stays in the University?

WEK

I have a pretty clear sense of the most important things to move on. I think many of these things would have been done by now, but until a decision has been made, I would not undertake any major changes that would affect the structure of MFRI, but once that decision is made, we move quickly on such things as the administrative location of MFRI, the relationship to the President's office, and some work on clarifying the mission of MFRI.

Don Mooney

Do you see anyway that MFRI's budget can be more visible to the outside world as far as what we're trying to accomplish? We probably have the third or fourth largest training program in the country. How can we better spend our money?

WEK

This is the heart of the issue. I'd like to say a few words on why Engineering is the right place for MFRI. We have within the College of Engineering one of the few fire protection programs in the country. Certainly considered to be among the fire protection programs one of the very best.

MFRI would be free standing but strongly related to Fire Protection. The research done in fire protection could have MFRI as an outlet, sort of the technology transfer arm of fire protection. I think that the College of Engineering is very different than the one of 1974 when this change was made. It is an excellent place, it was just rated as one of the 25 best in the country. MFRI would be affiliated with one of the best units on the College Park campus.

I believe that the MFRI budget should be identified as a line item within the College of Engineering budget. The Director would report to the Dean of Engineering, just as other directors report to the Dean. At present MFRI does have a line item within the College Park budget. But I don't see putting it in the College of Engineering in any way masking the budget or budget activity of MFRI.

Ed Quinn

I thought the questions of budgets was that people couldn't see what was happening to the money that was allocated. It appears that they don't like competing with the rest of the University for requests of money and especially when that money is limited state-wide such as now. With that in mind, there is an arrangement that was developed with UMAB, and I always wonder if that's what some people are trying to get when they talk about a separate line item. That arrangement was that any request made by MIMS would be reported onto the State untouched by the Hospital or UMAB. They could comment on it but they could not deny, they had to pass it on. Is that really what the problem of the line item in the budget as you see it?

WEK

I wouldn't have the final say on this. But my view is that I would prefer not to see such an arrangement. Because it would be hard to rationalize why MFRI should be treated differently than our Health Center or the Cooperative Extension Service or the Engineering Research Center, or the Library, etc. I think the University has to act responsibly and certainly there is no shortage of people watching what we're doing in regard to MFRI.

Tom Mattingly

How many other groups are there that you have to meet with that apply pressure?

WEK

I think that John experiences that more than I do. Basically there are two groups, the Maryland Fire Service and the President's Advisory Committee.

Tom Mattingly

Everyone is basically looking for some kind of guarantee that there will be a commitment by Engineering that they want and would pursue the charges that MFRI has. That is something that would help us decide.

WEK

I have spoken to Dean Dieter (one of the best deans in the country) he is in fact enthusiastic about the possibility of MFRI coming into the college. He sees it much the same way I do. However, the College of Engineering sets a standard of excellence for the campus. People who are used to excellence and doing things well will not accept a mediocre program.

Larry Preston

We in the fire service are very much concerned about the quantity and quality available to fire fighters across the state and that's primarily why we're here. One method we would have to measure would be to have a separate budget, something we could monitor. What Institutional commitments is the University prepared to make to convince this Commission that this would be the appropriate place to insure the availability and the increasing demands for fire service rescue training across the state?

WEK

What do you mean by commitments? If you're talking specifics, i.e., dollars and cents, it would be difficult for me to comment.

Larry Preston

Organizational structure, what type could be set up to insure that the training is provided.

WEK

I think that we would need, if MFRI stays in the University, is to re-look at the Mission Statement of MFRI, what it is that MFRI should be doing. It would be a process that would involve the advisory committee, Maryland State Firemen's Association would have input into that, I think we would make a commitment to developing a plan for MFRI. Establishing some objectives and goals for MFRI that would have indicators of progress towards meeting our goals. This would be a public document that would be shared with whoever was interested in the document.

Mr. Sturtz

I will pass

Bob Shiner

If MFRI stays within the University of Maryland, your plans are to put it under the College of Engineering, if it goes there would there still be that liaison between the Director of MFRI and the Dean of Engineering?

WEK

No it would be a direct reporting relationship.

Rocco Gabriel

My only concern has to do with management and I want to congratulate on dissolving the Management Council. My major concern would be if you make this move whether it stays in the President's office or moves to the College of Engineering will indeed the Director of MFRI be the CEO for MFRI? Will he have the ability to run the Institute?

WEK

My management philosophy is that responsibility should be pushed down to the lowest possible level in terms of operation. The Director of MFRI would report directly to the Dean of Engineering, with no intermediate person. I know Dean Dieter's management style, I'm certain you would find that he delegates the responsibility for the management of the various operations to the heads of those units.

~~The notion of demotion of MFRI. The difficulty with the operation being~~ in the President's Office is oddly rather than having greater attention, it gets less attention. It gets less attention because the President of a University of the size and complexity of College Park does not have the time to oversee an operational unit. MFRI would get more attention if it reported to someone who did that have type of responsibility.

Leonard King

Is John Menard liaison or supervisor?

WEK

He is liaison.

Joe Robison

If for some reason some other university came to you and said would you like to have this program, would you let MFRI in?

WEK

I believe it would depend on the nature of the university. If I were at one similar to College Park, I could very well support letting MFRI in. At some school like Cal Tech, probably not. It would depend on the nature of the University.

Some people keep saying to me that MFRI is a headache for College Park, we have had problems, but MFRI can also be a great asset to College Park.

Kevin O'Connor

No questions

Chief O'Connor

MFRI has a charge to train career and volunteer fire fighters. Major role is training volunteers. How does MFRI train and help career who have needs.

WEK

I think MFRI needs to be more involved in applied research on fire fighting and providing the latest techniques in fire fighting down to the working level. It needs to be heavily involved in curriculum development for the training academies around the state. Be there as a resource, training the trainers. MFRI should provide the entry-level training in regions of the state with no alternatives but should deemphasize that kind of training where there are adequate facilities in a region.

Chief O'Connor

In defense of MFRI and being concerned about volunteer and career fire fighters, there are a lot of external forces that have been acting on fire service, I still think the funding is inadequate.

Chair

If MFRI was set up in the College of Engineering, and these gentlemen had problems, how fast could you fix them?

WEK

That's a difficult question to answer, I think one of the fortunate aspects of the new legislation that created the University of Maryland System is a much higher level of autonomy, more efficient, the environment exists now for us to be this way. We are a state agency and will always be bound by rules and regulations that govern the operation of all state agencies.

Chair

Meeting was adjourned at 6:21 p.m.

3801 Idle Court
Bowie MD 20715
Nov. 12, 1990

S. G. Fred Frederick
Chairperson
Executive Study Commission
on the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute
c/o Mr. Brian Darmody
Office of the President
University of Maryland at College Park
2101 Main Administration Building
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dear Mr. Frederick:

I would like to offer the following suggestions regarding the mission and future of MFRI. Professionally, I am a naval architect and Division Director for the Naval Sea Systems Command. I am a former faculty member of the U. S. Naval Academy and I am currently a volunteer Sergeant in the Bowie Volunteer Fire Dept.

My first exposure to MFRI came when I joined the Bowie Volunteer Fire Department in 1968. MFRI has always had an excellent reputation as a training organization. You have an opportunity to think beyond that traditional role, and I encourage you to seize the opportunity to do something that would be good for Maryland and good for the fire-rescue service.

The Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services System (MIEMSS) has gained a national reputation for excellence and has an established leadership role in EMS. Maryland is a more desirable place to live because of that leadership. I encourage you to adopt a vision which creates for MFRI the same position in fire-rescue service leadership that MIEMSS has created in EMS leadership.

I believe that the pieces are all in place to create a center of excellence. By virtue of being located at the University of Maryland at College Park, MFRI can access the assets of one of the few Fire Protection Engineering programs in the United States. Also available are the facilities, faculty and students of the engineering, science and business departments. Students are required to pursue research topics and theses. Directing attention of faculty and students to the needs of the fire service would promote development of new equipment and methods. Location of the training

Md. Y 3. Fi 52 :2/F /990-
Executive Study Commission

facilities and experienced MFRI firefighting instructors at the University would provide the opportunity to give these new concepts realistic tests. The commercial market for improved devices and training methods is enormous, and Maryland businesses could be the direct beneficiaries.

I am not suggesting that MFRI change from an educational to a research institute, but that MFRI expand its role to encourage and focus research within the University. MFRI is ideally located, both physically and managerially, to interact with and focus the research resources of a nationally recognized university. This attention is sorely needed in the fire-rescue service. This type of interaction works well. I have used it successfully throughout my professional engineering career with the U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard.

With vision, MFRI could evolve from something good to something great, with a national reputation rivalling that of MIEMSS. Should you not choose that vision, I still believe that MFRI should remain a part of the University of Maryland system. Association with the academic environment promotes a high standard of education and training. It gives the training more stature in the eyes of the student, and it gives the instructors resources to draw upon to improve the effectiveness of their classes.

Finally, as a taxpayer, I am opposed to recreating something that works and that has all the pieces in place. Instead, I encourage you to look at the potential that exists in MFRI as a component of the University of Maryland and jump on this chance to make MFRI something special for Maryland's citizens and the Nation's fire-rescue service.

Attached are only a few examples of applied research projects which would involve faculty and students throughout the University, and provide opportunities for Maryland businesses. I would be pleased to discuss my experience with this type of program with Commission members at a mutually convenient time.

Very truly yours,



Howard A. Chatterton
301-262-7298 (h)
703-602-9250, 9251 (o)

Project #1: Effectiveness of Visual and Audible Warning Systems for Emergency Vehicles.

High density construction along local roads and high speeds allowed on interstate highways limit the effective range of warning systems. What catches people's attention? How do they recognize an emergency vehicle? What is effective in these environments?

Participants - Electronic and mechanical engineers, biological scientists.

Project #2: Improved Protective Clothing

Heat stress is a major limitation for fire fighters. What materials and clothing concepts provide heat protection and limit heat stress? What are appropriate materials for hazardous material protection?

Participants - Chemists and chemical engineers, biological scientists

Project #3: Design Considerations for Emergency Vehicles.

Fire apparatus is subject to different driving conditions and mechanical loads than ordinary heavy vehicles. How should conventional truck design be modified to accommodate the steering, acceleration and braking requirements of the fire service?

Participants - Mechanical engineers

Project #5: Improved Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus

Existing breathing apparatus is bulky, heavy and has a limited air supply. The facepieces preclude effective communication and scratch easily, limiting visibility. There is a world-wide market for improved breathing apparatus for both commercial and emergency services applications.

Participants - Mechanical engineers, chemists and chemical engineers, biological scientists

Project #6: Improved Foam and Foam Appliances

Existing foams are expensive and require special applicators. Foams have varying "life" and some break down more quickly than others. Foam generators and nozzles are needed that can be backfit on existing fire apparatus and which will provide proper aeration.

Participants - Mechanical engineers, chemists and chemical engineers

Project #7: Improved Communications Equipment

Most fire fighters wearing breathing apparatus cannot effectively communicate. The mask interferes with conventional radio use. Fire fighters cannot coordinate their efforts or call for help if in trouble.

Participants - Electronic engineers

Project #8: Minimum Staffing for Emergency Services

The major cost of operating an emergency service is staff compensation. What are the limits for minimum staffing? What controls these limits? What technology changes have potential to lower staffing costs?

Participants - Business and management students

Project #9: Biological Factors Affecting Emergency Services Providers

What biological factors are important in training emergency services providers? What changes in physical conditioning, equipment design and protective clothing design would minimize those differences?

Participants - Biological sciences students



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

15 July 1991

Ruth Hodgson
Maryland State Law Library
Court of Appeals
361 Rowe Blvd.
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Ms. Hodgson,

Mr. Brian Darmody has asked me to respond to your inquiry about the Final Report of the Executive Study Commission on the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute.

The Final Report noted (page two) that the minutes of the meeting of 13 December 1990 would be issued later as an appendix. The minutes are now available and I am sending you a copy.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Toby Linden".

Toby Linden
Staff Assistant

EXECUTIVE STUDY COMMISSION ON THE MARYLAND FIRE AND RESCUE INSTITUTE

Minutes of MFRI Study Commission Meeting
December 13, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m., with a quorum present. Present were: Robert H. Shimer, Rocco Gabrielle, Leonard King, Laurence Preston, Fred Frederick, Tom Mattingly, Ed Quinn, Steve Cox, Robert DiPietro, Joseph Robison, William Aamos, Ron Milor, and Chuck Sturtz and Brian Darmody.

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

The Chair proceeded to thank the committee on the behalf of the Governor for attending the meetings and reading all the information provided. He noted that this meeting must come to a conclusion.

Chair noted that it was obvious that the Committee would be unable to address all of the decisions. Chair asked the committee to provide models based on their decision of what it is the committee needs to address, how we can address them and provide a model that will be workable, addresses the budget constraints, something that will respond to this issue in a fairly prompt manner.

Chair noted he did not know how the Governor would respond to whatever it is that the Commission gives him.

Brian Darmody proceeded to put on the board those items that need to be addressed in whatever decision we reach.

1. Placement of MFRI
2. Conflicting pressures on Executive Director
3. Visibility of MFRI in budget process
4. Acceptance of regional training centers
5. Improved Mission Statement for MFRI

After considerable discussion by the members of the Commission it was decided that no firm final decision could be reached. The Commission then passed the following motion.

"Motion made to direct Dr. Kirwan to implement changes outlined in the Administrative Review. Commission to request Governor to extend jurisdiction of Commission beyond December 15, 1990 deadline. Commission will

continue to examine organizational models for placement of MFRI as well as other charges outlined in Governor's Executive Order and will review progress of implementation of Administrative Review."

The meeting adjourned was adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute Open Hearing
Wednesday, November 7, 1991 ○
7:00 p.m.
Center of Adult Education
University of Maryland University College

Transcription of Tape

Opening Statement by Chair Fred Frederick

Ladies and gentlemen, the hour has arrived. I will call this public hearing to order. I would first of all like to introduce to you the Commission members. My name is Fred Frederick. I am the chairman. And if the Commission members who are present will raise your hands, I would appreciate it. Thomas A. Mattingly, President of the Maryland State Firemen's Association; Chief Peter J. O'Connor, Chairman of the Maryland Metropolitan Fire Chiefs; Mr. Leonard P. King, President of the Maryland Chiefs Association; Lawrence L. Preston, Chairman of the Council of Fire Academies; Ronald W. Milor, President of the Maryland State and D.C. Professional Fire Fighters Association; Kevin B. O'Connor, Career Fire Service Representative; Charles Sturtz, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, University of Maryland (he had another meeting, he was with us previously), he represents the President of the University of Maryland College Park; the Honorable William H. Amoss is not here, he is a member of the Senate nominated by the President; the Honorable Robert J. DiPietro, the Maryland House of Delegates, nominated by the Speaker; J. Donald Mooney, Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service Representative; Robert H. Shimer, Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service Representative; the Honorable Mayor Joseph R. Robison, Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service Representative; Mr. Steven D. Cox, Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service Representative.

We are here as a result of Executive Order COMAR 01.1.19.90.14. There are a lot of "whereas" and I'm sure you are not interested in that, so in the interest of time, I'll go down to the duties of this commission.

- To identify the current objectives, goals and structure of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute, ascertain if they are adequately meeting the needs of the Maryland fire and rescue services.
- Recommend goals and objectives that should be included in any future mission statement to be created by the Institute's leadership.
- Recommend a governance structure with clearly defined lines of authority that will be able to fully meet the Institute's goals and objectives.

- Recommend where the Institute should be administratively placed with State government and recommend any changes that would promote the interests of the State, the fire and rescue services, and the Institute.
- The Commission shall complete its study and forward its preliminary report to the Governor by November 15, 1990, with a final report to be submitted by December 15, 1990.

Those of you who know the Governor know that he means business, and we are doing everything we can to meet this schedule. This will be our fourth meeting. We will have additional meetings, but they will come after the 15th, I hope.

You are invited to speak on this issue. Your comments will be recorded. They'll become a part of this report. I would like for you to introduce yourself, tell us where you reside, and if you are representing anyone. If you are representing an organization, you have five minutes, and if you are representing yourself as an individual, you have three minutes. I have three names here, which may make this a very short meeting, but anyone here is entitled to speak. So, if you do want to speak, if you'll go back and give the secretary your name, she will bring it to me and as we go on we certainly want to hear from anyone who has an interest in this executive order.

With that, I will call the first speaker, Mr. Jim Lyons, of the Harford County Volunteer Fire Association. Are you speaking for the Association, sir?

Testimony of Jim Lyons

Yes, sir.

Good evening. I am going to make it real short and sweet. Our association has not taken a formal stand but they are concerned. Basically, what our association is concerned about and looking for and individually as well is good basic accountability of MFRI and the University of Maryland. Actually quoting from the mission of MFRI which is training of fire and rescue. If the University of Maryland cannot guarantee providing these services, let's find a better way. I will take a few seconds out. As far as we are concerned and speak very proudly and congratulations to our regional group out of MFRI and MFRI generally that they are doing a fantastic job as far as we are concerned.

Two other things. We would like additional copies of the actual charge. And as promptly as you can, we certainly would like to have copies of your November 15th recommendations so we can see what kind of actions and recommendations the committee is going to take.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Frederick: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone on the Commission that would have a question for Mr. Lyons. If not, I would like to respond to you with regard to the November 15th letter. We expect and hope that he will accept what we have done up to now and what we plan to do as our report. He may throw me out of the office and say come back with some concrete prose. And, if he does, then this committee will be called immediately into session and we'll come up with an answer, but that answer would be if he doesn't accept the first one. So, I can't truthfully tell you today, and I guess I'm the guy in the middle here, I can't tell you that this Commission has leaned definitely one way or another. We have not reached that point in our deliberations. But we will share with you the letter in any event.

Mr. Lyons: We'd like to know how you're going and what your recommendations are and that certainly will have an impact on the field, that's for sure.

Mr. Frederick: Thank you very much. Mr. Thomas Wilson of Cambridge, Maryland.

Testimony of Thomas Wilson

Good evening. Mr. Chairman. I am representing the full-time faculty of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My colleagues would like to thank you for this opportunity to brief you this evening. I am here representing the full-time faculty of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute. More of our faculty would be here tonight, but they are committed to field assignments across the state as you well know. We would like to let you know that we are one hundred percent unanimous in favor of maintaining association with the University of Maryland at College Park. I would like to share with you this evening some of the reasons why.

You may know about the quality of numerous support and educational services which are found here on the campus. For example, the Computer Science Center, for the evaluation and correlation of our exams; the extensive library facilities for research; the availability of professors who contact researchers with their expertise in many of the areas which we now teach in our programs; the excellent reputation that the MFRI programs enjoy worldwide due in large part because both the University of Maryland name is on the certificates, in part because of the students who complete our courses. We are very concerned that our accountability and organization would diminish if we were separated from the University of Maryland. We have an excellent secretarial and clerical staff, and many who have been with MFRI for five, ten, fifteen or more years and are extremely knowledgeable of our programs and procedures. Most of these people would not transfer to a new agency outside the University. Consider, if you

will, the length of time that it would take to build a new staff and still not have the experience and expertise that our present staff has.

MFRI enjoys many financial benefits due to our association with the University that we would have to pay for if we were located somewhere else outside the University. For example, Physical Plant maintenance for our office building in Berwyn Heights, the Training Academy and the regional centers, legal counsel, vehicle maintenance, purchasing assistance, accounting, engineering, and architectural services. Also, the availability of student assistants from the campus.

There is a strong concern with some of our employees about the possible loss of benefits associated with optional retirement systems which are available through the University community and not available for non-University personnel.

The benefits of job protection for the faculty as opposed to becoming unclassified state employees without simply no job protection. The faculty and staff of MFRI enjoy very much being associated with the ~~flagship campus of a nationally~~ acclaimed major university and hold that the emergency services training programs which are associated with an educational institution are more successful and have more credibility with those which do not enjoy such an association. And also, always when there is an association with a major university, on the whole that is true. For example, Texas, Oregon, Oklahoma to name a few as well as Maryland.

We recognize that there are a number of problems existing at the present time in MFRI. Many of these have been identified in the internal review which was recently completed. Some of these problems are due in small part because we are a small part in a larger organization. Some of the problems are internal. Still others are due to influences which are neither internal nor university related. We feel very strongly that Dr. Kirwan and the University should be given an opportunity to address the problems identified in the internal review and to be able to do so without the constant demand of other organizations. They should have the time to see if the changes will have the desired effect. Unless the identified problems -- both internal and external -- are addressed, moving MFRI to another agency will simply physically move the problems and they will continue to exist in simply another location.

In closing, in view of Dr. Kirwan's sincere desire to address the problem and to make MFRI a more viable part of the University, he should be given the opportunity to do so. If his efforts fail -- and we don't think they will -- then MFRI can always be moved. But, if MFRI moves now, without the problems being addressed and solved, and with some of the serious concerns that we have mentioned ignored, we will never be able to be brought back to the University community. We feel that the reputation, credibility and quality of MFRI as recognized and envied around the world would be lost and at the very least severely compromised if MFRI would be removed from the University association.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your time.

Mr. Frederick: Thank you, just a second, sir. Any questions from any of the Commission members.

Q: Yes. Are you speaking for the faculty and the clerical staff and so forth?

A: I'm here tonight representing the full-time faculty.

Q: And not the clerical staff.

A: I am not authorized to speak for them. We have a separate organization and I represent the full-time faculty.

Mr. Frederick: Any other questions on the part of the Commission? I'd like to ask you a question. On a scale of one to ten, how important do you think the users of the system feel being associated with the University of Maryland is?

A: That's hard to state speaking for all the users, but I do know that in the region I represent which is the Lower Shore region, this is something that I've been hearing more and more frequently as the possibility of us being moved has come about. I'd say this time a year ago, if you ask the rank and file fire fighters and rescue squad personnel in the field, there probably wasn't a whole lot of concern. But I think since there has been the possibility of moving, at least in the Lower Shore region, more and more people are aware of that and they tell me, anyway, that they are very proud of the fact that they are part of the University -- at least our credentials are. On a scale of one to ten statewide -- I have done any kind of research on that, it would just have to be a wild guess.

Mr. Frederick: Do you find that the users of the system object to travelling from the Eastern Shore to the College Park campus.

A: By and large, I feel that if it's a program that for whatever reason it would not be feasible to offer in the Eastern Shore because facilities may not be available, they are more than willing to travel for a weekend short course or some kind of special program. One of our week long programs, for example, is proportionately well represented by the Shore. Geographic is pretty well represented from the lower areas of the Eastern Shore and Western Maryland.

Mr. Frederick: You represent Western Maryland as well.

A: No sir. The Lower Eastern Shore.

Mr. Frederick: Is anybody here from Western Maryland that could respond to that question? Do you get some adverse reaction travelling to the College Park campus by the users of the system?

Answer from the audience: Mr. Chairman, I guess the response by people in Western Maryland to come to College Park is very minimal. If classes come that way, they attend, but if you go back and check the records, you will find very few people coming to College Park for a class.

Mr. Wilson: I think that one thing that I seem to find in talking to some of the people in the rural areas that occasionally they welcome the opportunity to go to classes and meet and talk with fire fighters in some other parts of the states. So, what I'm saying is that if we offered all of the programs in each of the regions, there would tend to be an isolationism and they would only be able to associate with people in their own community, their own small geographical area. And I think this is one of the many benefits of having specialized programs in certain areas and giving people the opportunity to travel. Again, MIEMSS offers a program once a year -- it's a weekend program -- that is very well attended with people pretty much across the state.

Mr. Frederick: The people that you represent, if they did not suffer any adverse impact as a result of retirement and benefits they now enjoy, would that change their attitude if they were to move off campus in a separate agency, do you think, in your opinion?

A: In my opinion, I think there still would be a resistance because -- I know this is hard to put in words -- the majority of the faculty have a real pride in being associated with a major university that they would not have if they were under some other agency. I think I'm safe in saying this. I want to say that I graduated from here and there is a lot of pride in now being a faculty member here. And some of our faculty have had the opportunity to travel in different states and I think that all of them would agree that the comments that they review and receive from people from other states when they have the opportunity to go to national conferences, they are always extremely positive - - whether it be California or Tennessee or wherever. We do have a national reputation.

Mr. Frederick: I can share with you that earlier this evening we met in a very candid interchange with Mr. Hoglund who we appreciate very much his frankness with us, and we also met with Dr. Kirwan and he wants to keep MFRI on campus. There isn't a question in his mind. So, if you were wondering that is his position. Thank you very much.

Q: Mr. Chairman, if I may. Mr. Wilson, you made the statement in regards to some requirements that the staff recognizes problems that were presented in the internal review report and that you felt only appropriate that Dr. Kirwan be given the opportunity to address these problems and get the house in order so to speak. In your opinion, and I know you can't speak for the full-time staff totally, if this was not done

within a reasonable time, would you then support a move from the University of Maryland to some other location or some other agency?

A: I think that we have discussed this as a faculty informally, never an official position on that particular question. But we feel that as far as this Commission is concerned the recommendations all of us would say that as long as whatever decision was reached in a fair and open mind and Dr. Kirwan is allowed to address the problems and within a reasonable time, whatever somebody defines as reasonable, and the problems are still existing or can't be solved, then I think yes, we would agree.

Q: What does the full-time staff feel is reasonable?

A: (Chuckle) I don't know. I think that that's something depending on individual issues.... some obviously can show results a lot quicker than some others. To say, six months or one year. I think it would be tough. I think you would agree if I asked you the same question.

Q: Obviously, you have had privy to review the internal review and so forth.

A: Well, I will say in all candidness, I have got what I assume a copy of what it was supposed to be. Now whether it is the entire document, I honestly don't know.

Q: Well, but what you've seen, do you have any problems with its accuracy as far as you see it, the problems within MFRI being within the University and so forth. Do you agree with the basic recommendations of the committee?

A: I think it's safe to say that based on what I have seen and the other members of the faculty, we did several months ago at the request of Dr. Kirwan as a faculty, we went through the document and made recommendations to him of what we felt as a faculty.

Q: Then really you have seen the official document and you don't have any heartburn about what was recommended and that type of thing.

A: No.

Q: Tom, in your view, what is the number one need and/or problem facing the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute right now that has brought about this whole mission and the legislation from last year and the whole thing? If you had to summarize it in one need or problem.

A: I think that one of the problems that all of us identify at MFRI is that the large variety and number of organizations that come to "advise" MFRI (I use that word loosely not to refer to any particular group). It seems that there is a confusion of sometimes based on the members of the particular organization from year to year to

year. There seems to be a change in philosophy and this, at times, tends to pull us in different directions I guess is one way of looking at it. That's one problem that we feel internally is a major problem.

Q: In that regard, does that include being pulled between different organizations between MFRI itself and its parent organization being College Park and its president?

A: Would you repeat that please, I'm not sure I got the full gist, you say pulled between....

Q: Yeah, do you think that they are getting mixed messages from the administrative powers that be from above within the University, I mean above MFRI beyond the Director's level? But still within the University.

A: I still occasionally, again I and most of our faculty are not involved in a lot of these meetings with policy and procedures or even with recommendations. But the perception is that there seems to be conflicting signals sometimes between MFRI and, since we are currently under Dr. Kirwan's office, and Dr. Kirwan's office and maybe some of the information, advice, direction that he may receive from the Board of Advisors and other organizations who have input to Dr. Kirwan concerning the direction and mission of MFRI. Dr. Kirwan has mentioned to me on an individual basis that he wonders sometimes how he keeps it all straight himself because he is getting sometimes mixed signals. Not that he is criticizing; we are not criticizing him in particular. We just think that the whole advisory process to MFRI could be streamlined and narrowed. Whether we stay within the University or go somewhere else, we still think that that's something that should be looked at.

Mr. Frederick: OK, thank you very much. Are there any other questions from the Commission.

Q: You know, one of the concerns is the fact of the budget deal and I guess an indirect question, do you feel that MFRI is really (and no reflection on the staff or anything else) ... but it's really fulfilling the mission that it's supposed to fulfill for the training of the fire fighters in this state and if not, to what degree? And maybe that's not a fair question, maybe I should rephrase it and say, what do you see as MFRI's role as a faculty members? What do you see as MFRI's role in training the fire fighters of this state, or the emergency services people of this state?

A: I think that I will try to sum that up. Obviously, our mission is providing the most advanced, state-of-the-art, up-to-date training that is available within the confines of the budget and the demands from the various user groups -- individual as well as organization -- to the best of our ability. I tell you the honest truth, if you ask what our budget is right now, I couldn't begin to tell you what our budget is. I haven't the foggiest idea. Maybe I should know. But, anyway, I think that by my observations and working with my superiors that in the past several years there has been some

discussion about MFRI not having enough money to provide the classes that had been requested. That may be true at the beginning of teaching. In the training year, it may look like we could never provide the classes that all people are requesting. But I think if you go back and look at our records for the past several years, I think it's safe to say that the individual companies or areas or jurisdictions may not have gotten the exact class when they want it, but I think it's safe to say that by the end of the year, they did get that class. Now, whether all the user groups and all the individuals, the departments or organizations are satisfied.... we are meeting our mission. As I see our mission, it is to provide the training. Most of our staff are involved in professional or MFRI oriented research to try to stay on top of the latest in transit or techniques, procedures.

Q: We were advised earlier today that the Management Council has been dissolved and I think that that's one thing some members of the Commission were glad to hear because they thought that's where some of the problems lie as far as the management. Did you as full-time faculty have any input into the Management Council?

A: The reason I'm smiling Bob is because it's interesting that I met with Dr. Kirwan two weeks ago. He asked me almost a similar question. What was MFRI's faculty's perceptions of the Faculty Council. I told him that based on my thought and my informal conversations with the rest of the faculty, we weren't sure of exactly what they did. And I can say this in all candidness because we as a faculty did not get feedback or request for input to the Faculty Council. So, we weren't sure what they did, what their responsibilities were. We knew the members of the Management Council. Other individuals may have been asked for input at different times, but as a faculty group, we were not asked nor were we advised if some decision was made that affected the operation or something else. I do understand from talking with one of the members that the Management Council did not vote per say. It wasn't a body that got together and voted on whatever decision. So, it did not vote to dissolve itself more or less.

Mr. Frederick: Thank you very much. We appreciate your input and if there are no more questions. The next gentleman I'll call on is Mr. Clarence Carpenter.

Testimony of Mr. Carpenter

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Committee, Mr. Chairman. I think most of you all know me. I am President of Potomac Heights Volunteer Fire Department Rescue Squad. I am also a past president of the Maryland State Firemen's Association. During my service, I was fortunate that we were in the process of getting a regional training center in the state in my county -- Charles County. You wouldn't believe the opposition we ran into for ten years after we got the piece of property. The only reason we got it in ten years is because the U.S. government was going to charge us tax if we didn't develop it in ten years. So, that's a big concern. My

concern, of course, is with the objectives and goals of MFRI and I feel that they should be building these regional training centers at a much faster rate. We've gone through ten year plans that show that at the end of that period, we have six or seven regional centers. We still only have one and another one under construction. And the ten year plan is over with. We are going into the next plan. And I just feel that something has to be done. If we come up with a plan, let's stick a little bit closer to it than the last one.

Also, there have been problems of charging volunteers to take classes. I believe, I'm not sure, but I believe we still have to pay for our EMT manuals. I know my company paid for mine. And I just don't think we should have to pay for these classes or these manuals.

During my term as president of the Firemen's Association, I was very closely associated with MFRI, the University and the training centers, and it seems the problem was always funding -- I guess that's the way it always is all the way around. When you try to find out where the problem is, you run into a bind because the University passes it on to Annapolis, Annapolis says they don't cut any money out of MFRI's budget, they only cut the total University budget, so who is cutting what? I mean, there is no way to find out why. I think what it really has to come down to is when a budget is presented for MFRI, that what has to be -- MFRI's budget. I don't care who has to approve it. When it's approved, whatever the amount is, if it's for MFRI, then it's to be for MFRI. I don't think we should have to say the University is going to And I'm saying, I don't have a problem where MFRI is located. I'm only concerned with training firemen and rescue personnel. I don't care who is top echelon. But, when some money is set aside for MFRI, that's where it ought to be spent. Now, so far, the only people apparently that can set aside money for MFRI is the University. Annapolis apparently has no say. Now, I'll tell you something about the capital budget. That's an interesting point. When we were put in the capital budget, we were at the bottom. Now, you might have forty projects and they were only going to fund ten. How are we going to get funded if we are forty? And that's the way it went until we finally had a meeting with the legislators from the federal level on down the line. And finally we got ourselves moved up in the top ten and that's how we finally got the first training center of the ground. But, I think this is terrible that we've gone this many years and we are still looking for number two to be finished and haven't even started on number three yet. There should be six or seven in my opinion. Now, if we can come up with the fact that we only need five or six, well that's another point. But there should be centers in Western Maryland and lower Eastern Maryland, Southern Maryland, Lower Shore, Upper Shore. And that's the way I feel. Any questions, I'd be glad to answer.

Mr. Frederick: I'd like to give you the information that we have about the budget. The budget is \$3 million and is a budget that is not treated like other budgets within the campus. They are assessed 3% of their budget as an overhead expense and MFRI

is not assessed that amount of money. I'd like to call on Mr. Cox to tell you about the manuals.

Mr. Cox: The Emergency Care Manuals are provided to the students.

Mr. Carpenter: They are now? Because I bought mine twenty years ago. For a number of years they weren't.

Mr. Frederick: Are there any other questions by any of the Commissioners?

Q: You said there needs to be a method for identifying MFRI's budget. What would you like to see? I mean, you know what the budget process is. How would you like to see it come out?

A: I'd like to see it presented as a budget for MFRI and then, if it's approved in that amount, that's what MFRI gets.

Q: You'd like to see their budget request submitted so you can understand it and then you want to know where it went and who chopped it where, right?

A: That's correct. When I was president of Southern Maryland, we were asking for funds to complete the center, run the center, maintain the center, and they got chopped off? Where did they get chopped off? I couldn't find out. The University says our budget was cut in Annapolis. I go to Annapolis and they say we never have cut one penny of MFRI's budget because we don't approve MFRI's budget. We approve MFRI's budget which is about this thick and MFRI's budget is a couple of pages in it. So, I'm saying that the University tells me that their budget was cut. I don't care about their cut budget. I mean as a fireman I don't. As a citizen, I do. Not as a fireman. I am concerned about MFRI's budget. I don't want to be told that MFRI's budget was cut.

Mr. Frederick: Thank you very much. We have another speaker. Mr. Ray Bendt.

Testimony of Mr. Ray Bendt

I am chapter representative of University of Maryland Classified Employees and I have been asked by the members of the Institute to please ask you not to take them out of the University because the benefits they have as University employees are better than state employees. They feel that being associated with the University gives them tuition benefits and they are able to take advantage of the education assistance provided both for them and their families. They feel that if they are taken out and put someplace else, they would not get the tuition benefits. State employees get paid low salaries and the extra benefit of free education is helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Frederick: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Yes, Mr. King.

Q: You represent the Maryland Classified Employees. You say that the University employees get better benefits than anybody else that might work for the state of Maryland.

A: There are certain benefits that are better.

Q: And you feel that that's fine. Is that because it's academic?

A: We feel the University is located in an area where it is expensive. It is very hard for our members even here for salaries and benefits to survive.

Q: You mean College Park?

A: That's right.

Q: What about the people from Eastern Shore? There is life over there.

A: The Eastern Shore people will also have better benefits. All state employees are underpaid as far as being competitive on the outside and it does help that employees are able to have some benefit for education for their children.

Q: So the whole thing is that free education is the extra benefit?

A: That's definitely very important.

Q: You are speaking for all the employees now -- classified, am I right?

A: He is representing everyone other than faculty.

Mr. Frederick: Are there any other questions by any of the Commission members? If not, thank you very much. Is there anyone else here who would like to speak to this matter? If not, I can tell you that this record will be kept open. Any information you send me will be distributed to the rest of the Commission immediately. We will be happy to talk with anyone who has any information that would aid in this decision. We have been involved in this for approximately five weeks and I can tell you that there is no way everybody is going to be happy. There are too many factions. But we are going to do the best we can, speaking for the Commission, for the state of Maryland, for the employees of MFRI, the University of Maryland, and the fire and rescue personnel who use the system. With that, I thank you very much for your time and attention. Drive safely.

PROPOSED PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

MARYLAND FIRE AND RESCUE INSTITUTE

(a) MISSION: The mission of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute is to advance the professional development of fire, rescue and emergency medical services personnel, and other persons engaged in similar activities in the State of Maryland and elsewhere. This mission is accomplished by the development and delivery of training and education programs in areas such as fire prevention and control, rescue, and emergency medical care at a central facility and through a regional delivery system.

(b) DIRECTOR: The Institute shall be headed by a Director. The Director shall be appointed by . The organizations represented on the Board of Advisors and other interested groups shall provide advise to the on nominees for the position of Director.

(c) POWERS OF THE DIRECTOR: The Director of the Institute is authorized to:

(1) develop and revise curricula, standards for admission and performance, and criteria for the awarding of certificates;

(2) appoint such faculty and other personnel as he/she determines to be necessary or appropriate, subject to the personnel regulations of the State of Maryland;

(3) conduct courses and programs of training and education, as defined in subsection (d) of this section;

(4) conduct industrial fire, rescue, and emergency medical training at the Institute and elsewhere, establish the necessary fees and other charges to offer such training, use any profits from this industrial training to supplement budget needs in other field program offerings of the Institute;

(5) conduct short courses, seminars, workshops, conferences and similar education and training activities in all parts of the State; Funding for such activities should be provided for in the budget of the Institute and/or from other earned income;

(6) enter into such contracts as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the Institute;

(7) cooperate with other agencies that provide training for fire, rescue, and emergency medical services personnel;

(9) develop programs to inform the public of the dangers of fire and measures to prevent or reduce the harm caused by fire;

(10) conduct research and develop new fire, rescue, and emergency medical services training and techniques;

(11) develop, maintain, operate a central training facility and regional training facilities necessary to carry out the mission of the Institute;

(12) develop and submit the necessary budget request to carry out the mission of the Institute;

(13) prepare and update a master plan identifying goals and objective of the Institute;

(14) consult with officials of the Maryland fire, rescue, and emergency medical services and other interested persons in the exercise of the foregoing powers.

(d) PROGRAM OF THE INSTITUTE: The Director is authorized to:

(1) train fire, rescue, and emergency medical services personnel in such skills and knowledge as may be useful to advance their ability to prevent and control fires, rescue entrapped victims, and provide emergency medical care, including, but not limited to:

(A) techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, firefighting, and arson detection;

(B) tactics and command of firefighting, rescue, and emergency medical services for present and future chiefs and commanders;

(C) administration and management of fire, rescue, and emergency medical services;

(D) training in the specialized fields of aircraft fire control and crash rescue, fire control and rescue aboard waterborne vessels, hazardous material spill control, disaster control and management, and other specialized fields as necessary;

(E) training in the specialized field of rescuing of entrapped victims from structure collapse, vehicular accidents, confined space and water and ice conditions;

(F) techniques of emergency medical care including basic and advanced life support;

(G) conduct instructor training for present and future instructors.

(2) develop model curricula, training programs, and other educational materials suitable for use at the Institute and at other educational institutions, and share this information among such institutions;

(3) provide fire, rescue, and emergency medical services training, education and material free of charge to all volunteer fire, rescue, and ambulance companies/departments within Maryland, such training shall be funded by an appropriation within the Institutes budget;

(4) develop and administer, in conjunction with the University of Maryland, a program of correspondence courses to advance the knowledge and skills of fire service personnel;

(5) encourage, in conjunction with the Office of the Maryland State Fire Marshal, the inclusion of fire prevention and detection technology and practices in the education and professional practices of architects, builders, city planners, and others engaged in design and planning affecting fire safety and prevention.

(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: The Director is authorized, to the extent that he/she determines it necessary to meet the needs of the State, to encourage new programs and to strengthen existing programs of education and training by local fire, rescue, and emergency medical services units and departments, local governments and private institutions, by providing technical assistance and advice to:

(1) vocational training programs in techniques of fire prevention and control, rescue of entrapped victims and emergency medical care;

(2) fire training courses and programs at junior colleges;

(3) four year degree programs in fire science and fire engineering at colleges and universities.

(f) ASSISTANCE: The Director is authorized to provide education and training and other related assistance to Federal, State, local and industrial fire, rescue, and emergency medical services training programs through grants, contracts, or otherwise.

(g) BOARD OF ADVISORS: The shall appoint nine individuals to serve on a Board of Advisors. The function of such board shall be to review, at least annually the program of the Institute and to make comments and recommendations to the regarding the operation of the Institute and any improvements therein which such board deems appropriate. Nominations for appointment to this board shall be presented to the from the leadership of the respective organization upon request. The Institute shall respond, in writing, on the disposition of said board recommendations.

(1) The Board of Advisors shall include a representative from the following organizations:

- (A) Maryland State Firemen's Association;
- (B) Maryland State Firemen's Association Firemen's Training Committee;
- (C) Maryland State Firemen's Association Emergency Medical Services Committee
- (D) Maryland Fire Chief's Association;
- (E) Maryland Council of Fire and Rescue Academies;
- (F) Maryland Fire and Rescue Education and Training Commission;
- (G) Maryland Metropolitan Fire Chiefs
- (H) Maryland-DC Professional Firefighters Union;
- (I) one member at large with particular interest in building construction and fire protection.

(3) Board member shall be appointed for two year terms for a maximum of four consecutive years. Terms will be staggered so that no more than five members of the board are subject to appointment each year. The terms of the board shall be based on Maryland fiscal year.

(4) The board shall elect from its membership an individual to serve as the chairman and vice chairman. The chairman will be responsible for presiding over the activities of the board and the vice chairman shall preside in the absence of the chairman.

(5) The Institute will be responsible for providing administrative support and assistance to the board.

(h) ACCREDITATION: The Director of the Institute is authorized and encouraged to pursue the accreditation of training and education courses and programs offered by the Institute.

(i) CERTIFICATION: The Institute will develop its training and education programs consistent with applicable national standards. The Institute will be authorized to issue certificates for successful completion of courses or programs. The Institute is encouraged to cooperate with the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services System in the certification of emergency medical services personnel, the Maryland Instructor Certification Review Board in the certification of instructors, and the Maryland Fire Services Professional Qualifications Board in the certification of firefighters, fire officers, apparatus operators and fire specialists.

(j) **ADMISSIONS:** The Director is authorized to admit to the courses and programs of the Institute individuals who are members of the firefighting, rescue, and emergency medical services of the State and such other individuals as he/she determines can benefit from attendance. Students shall be admitted with due regard to adequate representation in the student body of all geographic regions of the State. In selecting students, the Director may seek nominations and advice from the fire, rescue, and emergency medical services and other organization which wish to send students to the Institute.

Summary of Staff Interviews

Nine MFRI employees and one former employee accepted the invitation to discuss MFRI with a member of Internal Review Committee. Everyone began the discussion by saying that their purpose in asking for the interview was to provide informatuion that might help MFRI improve. They viewed the review process as an opportunity to get MFRI back into a leadership position. Most interviewees were dedicated employees and, for the most part, liked their jobs and didn't want to leave MFRI.

Some common threads ran through most of the discussions. The senior management of the Institute does not have the confidence of the staff. The Director and Associate Driector were described as fine men but not good leaders. The Director was accused by many staff as being unresponsive and failing to act. Most believe he's lost touch with the operations of the Institute. There were many complaints about one of the assistant directors. He is viewed as having no respect for regional faculty and has spoken disparangingly about them in front of other MFRI staff. Staff perceive a power struggle between the assistant directors. Sections don't cooperate but rather seem to compete with one another. Employees are frustrated by MFRI internal politics. There are too many levels of management. Several staff suggested that the Management Council should be eliminated although one thought it was good. Many problems are taken to the Management Council but are never resolved. Conflicting messages are received from management and it's difficult to get a commitment from them. Workers don't trust managers and managers frequently show a lack of respect for employees. It's interesting to note that staff thought, for the most part, that their own

units and their managers were okay; it was other units and managers that caused problems.

Regional faculty feel adequate attention is not given to the regions. They believe the regions are where the real work of MFRI is performed but management doesn't respect that work. Their facilities and equipment are of poor quality. The courses and materials they work with are outdated and of poor quality, and when courses are updated regional faculty are not permitted to have input into their development. There is little guidance and assistance for people in the field. It would be nice if senior management would visit field offices at least once a year. Regional people believe they have expertise and experience that could contribute to the development and welfare of MFRI, but no one asks or respects their ideas when they're offered.

There is much dissatisfaction with the hiring and promotion processes at MFRI. Employees feel the rules are changed on them. Decisions on promotions are not made objectively, but are dependent on who's in the "click." Rules on hiring change, with external candidate being favored sometimes and other times hiring is from within.

There were complaints about the lack of a computer system to link Berwyn Heights with the regions. Apparently, there is equipment available but no way has been developed to link the equipment and it is unused.

Finally, there seems to be consensus among the staff interviewed the MFRI has lost much of its former status. The Institute has been resting on its laurels and is no longer in the forefront of fire service education. These employees want to see MFRI regain its lost status and are willing to do what it takes to achieve that end.

Results of MFRI Staff Survey

As part of the administrative review of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute (MFRI), a survey was distributed to all 37 members of the regular staff. Completed surveys were received from 23 staff members: 9 faculty/management, 6 regional faculty, and 5 support staff. The response rates by employee category were: faculty/management 100.0%, regional faculty 37.5%, and support staff 41.7%.

I Objective

Asked to describe the objectives of MFRI, all but one respondent referred to the need to provide training for fire and other emergency service personnel in the State of Maryland. Many of the respondents stated that providing "quality" training was MFRI's objective. One respondent wasn't sure of MFRI's objectives. All of the respondents who were not support staff rated their work at the upper end of the 1-5 scale in importance, while support staff rated the importance of their work in the middle of the scale.

Asked if they understood how their job fits with others in achieving MFRI and campus goals, 77.8 percent of the faculty/managers and 80 percent of the regional faculty said yes, while 40 percent of the support staff do so. A variety of comments were made in response to this question. There appears to be uncertainty as to how MFRI and campus goals interlink and questions as to what the campus expects of MFRI. Several respondents were not sure of either MFRI or campus goals, while others stated that MFRI and campus goals were clear and easy to understand. Still others felt that when they were permitted to perform "their own" job, they understood how it fits into the accomplishment of goals.

Half of all respondents, both in total and by category, stated that they received conflicting messages regarding MFRI objectives from different levels in the supervisory chairs. Thirty-two percent sometimes received conflicting messages and 18 percent seldom did. The distributions were similar across the three job categories. A variety of comments were written to compliment responses to this item. The consensus appears to be that each organizational unit has it's agenda and that agenda isn't necessarily the same as that of senior management. As one respondent put it, "MFRI is too sectionalized... (R)ather than a MFRI mission, each division/section has its own priorities... (creating) an 'us against them' situation."

Seventy percent of the respondents believed that staff are not sufficiently involved in the formulation of plans and objectives. Again, the distribution of responses was similar across all three categories, although no support staff responded that they were involved in planning. Comments on this question were varied, ranging from the opinion that respondents were never asked for input, to statements that input wasn't utilized when it was solicited, to the opinion that regional cocordinator meetings provided opportunities for input, to the statement that there's too much input from staff and management should manage.

Most staff (87%) want to be more involved in the formulation of plans. Most respondents who commented on this question believed they had something to contribute and would like to participate in planning. One comment seems worth noting. "There are many intelligent, warm and caring regional representatives out there willing to help sail the ship. Currently, we are standing on the dock watching it flounder in high seas." On the other hand, two respondents were negative about involvement, one saying "definitely not" and one expressing concern that such involvement would require more time.

II Communications within the department

A majority of the MFRI staff (73%) believed there is confusion among staff concerning who is responsible for the overall direction of MFRI. Broken down by job category those believing there is confusion are: faculty/management - 67%, regional faculty - 83%, support staff - 50%, no category indicated - 100%. Comments on this question support the responses. Generally, it's unclear who's in charge, who makes decisions. "The Institute exists day to day with no direction." It's not clear who's responsible for what.

Only three respondents (13%) were unaware of the recent change in management authority among MFRI senior staff. Surprisingly, two of those three were in the faculty/management category. The comments suggest that most employees understand the change but many stated that they were never officially informed. They just "heard" about it. One respondent believes the Director "has apparently become the leader again, replacing the committee known as the Management Council."

Only two respondents (8%) felt they rarely received any information concerning MFRI. Sixty percent of the respondents believed they were informed, but not in a timely manner and the remaining 32 percent believed they were kept well informed. The responses were similar across job categories with one faculty/management and one support staff believing they were uninformed. The comments on this question suggest much information is received "through the grapevine" and there were several complaints concerning the slow rate at which mail is forwarded to regional coordinators.

Information is usually received from both supervisors and coworkers (78% of respondents) with 13 percent receiving information from supervisors and 9 percent from coworkers. Most respondents (70%) reported receiving information

verbally and 30 percent from memos. Thirteen staff did not respond to this section of the question.

Most respondents (73%) felt they had the freedom to speak to someone in authority concerning MFRI issues. Similarly 77 percent believed they had the opportunity to do so. Sixty-one percent sometimes took advantage of that opportunity, 28 percent frequently did, and 11 percent (both respondents were faculty/management) rarely did. Comments on these three questions suggest that while staff might feel free to talk to supervisors they don't believe it does any good. "Authority will listen but rarely solves the problem."

Twenty-two respondents offered suggestions on improving communications, but in reality many were comments on the operation of MFRI. Related to communications, suggestions were made to: improve mail to regional offices; communicate ahead of time, not after the fact; circulate items with a fixed date on a more timely basis; have Institute staff meetings quarterly or monthly; have the boss inform the staff concerning his travels; have Director and Associate Director visit each regional office at least annually; publish a weekly staff/faculty bulletin; develop an interoffice communication system (i.e., computers, fax, radio); exchange information concerning events in each region; invite faculty to attend advisory board meetings; stop the use of memos and increase face-to-face communications; have Management Council attend staff meetings; and distribute detailed minutes of Management Council meetings.

All of the regional faculty felt there were enough staff meetings while two-thirds of the faculty/management and those who listed no job category did so. One support staff thought there were enough, two did not think there were enough, and two did not respond. Suggestions concerning the frequency of staff meetings were monthly and biweekly, with one respondent suggesting frequency should be determined by need.

A slight majority (57%) thought the right people were not invited to staff meetings. Respondents suggested: Mr. Menard should be included, someone from Administration should attend, Institute Development should be excluded, that all field operations staff should not meet together, Management Council should attend, and associate and assistant managers should attend and then have meetings with their own staffs.

There was a near even split concerning the topics discussed at staff meetings. Comments suggest that too much time is spent on matters of minor importance and not enough on discussion of major issues. The majority of respondents (80%) felt that the appropriate amount of time was spent on each topic. Nevertheless, comments suggested that too much time was spent on routine items, topics were discussed that were not of interest to the staff, long discussions occurred concerning topics only administration could resolve, and long-standing issues are glossed over with no resolution.

Most staff (83%) thought staff meetings sometimes produced tangible results. Two respondents (11%) thought they usually did and one respondent thought they never did. Five staff members elected not to respond. Comments on this question suggest that there are issues discussed but never resolved, consensus is rarely reached. Institute Development Staff meetings "inform and motivate" while Field Operations meetings are "updates and 'bitch' sessions."

Many suggestions were made for reorganizing meetings to improve the individual's opportunity to participate. These included early distribution of agendas and backup reports, allowing those concerned to present and discuss the facts, dispensing with agenda and minutes and writing a memorandum about important topics, and permitting regional coordinators to meet with the Management Council. A few respondents saw no need to change staff meetings.

III Quality of Life

Respondents were asked to rate the work environment on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the best rating. The mean rating for the entire group was 6.7. Faculty/management rated the work environment at 7.9, regional faculty at 5.6, support staff at 6.6, and those not indicating a job category at 5.3.

A large majority of the respondents (86%) thought their supervisors were concerned about the quality of the work environment. Comments on this question indicate that employees are generally satisfied with conditions at Berwyn Heights, although someone expressed concern about environmental health and the need to test the building. Conditions at the regional offices are not as good as those in the main office.

Less than a quarter of the staff thought that all that could be done was being done to improve working conditions. All of the regional faculty thought not enough was being done. Lack of adequate funding is suggested as a reason for lack of improvement in working conditions. There was mention of unanswered complaints relating to daily headaches, water pressure, keys, and lack of outside air flow. A group of complaints appears to relate to regional offices: need for a cleaning service, need to purchase low-bid items that break, delays in getting furniture from state-use industries, and failure of regional offices to meet office space and equipment storage needs.

Respondents overall were evenly split on the question of having the tools and support they needed to do their job. Additional tools and support needs that were identified include: computer software support and training, modern audio-visual equipment; installation of available computers; janitorial support; telefax services; updated training aids; keys; reliable source of supply for forms, tools and equipment for regional centers; electronic mail; carphones, and a better radio system.

Close to three-quarters of the respondents thought their office/work environment was conducive to effective job performance. Again those working at Berwyn Heights seem to have few complaints. Two suggestions were made that offices in two divisions were too spread out. There was also a complaint about the key system. Workers apparently in the regional offices complained about: low-bid rental property not being conducive to conducting business with fire service leaders, lack of heat, poor office location leading to questions concerning personal safety, and poor quality of furniture.

Many suggestions were made for improving the office/work environment. Among them were: updated office furniture; relocating a group to provide more space for clerical staff; providing new, rather than used, furniture for regional offices; more file space; better air flow; laser printer; rekeying the building; better use of computer and computer system; janitorial services; better control of heat/AC system; and a full-time secretary.

Many respondents offered suggestions for improving morale and they covered a wide range of topics. Following is an attempt at summarization. The need for better, more open communication including staff meetings for everyone and expressions of appreciation for good performance. There needs to be more cooperation across MFRI units and less emphasis on sections resulting in more harmony. Two suggestions were made to change top management and one was made to remove the management "buffer zone" and let the Director and Associate Director run the Institute. Respondents suggested that promotions be made from within and that there be more equity in hiring. Standards for promotion and salary increases should be set and publicized. One employee suggested that MFRI should stop wasting money on equipment that isn't needed. Concentrate on program delivery as the primary goal of MFRI and eliminate political activities. Place emergency care training entirely with MIEMSS. One cause of low morale was said to be an internal power struggle and the

purported activities of an assistant director were detailed. Finally, a suggestion was made to cut down on rumors and discrimination.

IV Training and development

All but one of the employees responding believed they were adequately trained for their job. Several respondents believe they took the initiative for self training. Some employees felt they could use more training, noting the need for training in facilities design, purchasing and payroll. There was also a suggestion that regional and supervisory staff be offered a seminar on time management and conflict resolution.

All respondents reported that they had been given the opportunity to attend job-related training programs. Several reasons were given for the staff members' inability to attend such programs: lack of time, being away from the office, lack of funding for out-of-state conferences, job schedule, and too much work.

Several areas of development within MFRI were considered being overlooked. Faculty are not being developed academically and research is not encouraged. One respondent was told he/she needed a Master's degree to be promoted but finds it difficult to work toward the degree and simultaneously volunteer in the fire service. Suggestions were made for opportunities to develop management and interpersonal and communication skills. One respondent would like to see more emphasis placed on the development of new techniques for emergency services.

V Performance

Almost two-thirds of the respondents (62%) felt that they and their supervisor had a clear understanding of job expectations. Over 55 percent of the faculty/management respondents responded negatively to this question.

Many comments on this question suggest that employees get conflicting messages from their supervisors. One respondent thinks certain expectations are inappropriate but doesn't elaborate. There was also a complaint that a job description has not been updated to reflect additional work assignments.

Most employees (30%) stated that their performance was evaluated. Many respondents commented that they felt the evaluation was inappropriate, hurried, and too infrequent.

Generally, evaluation is written, although one respondent referred to a conference with his/her supervisor. Some employees are asked to complete an evaluation form on themselves. This form is then compared with one completed by the supervisor. Support staff are apparently evaluated using the University's standard evaluation form.

Two thirds of the employees responding did not consider the form of evaluation to be appropriate. Suggestions included more frequent evaluations, a larger number of categories, a form more specific to the individual, a more objective format with less reliance on supervisor's personal feelings, more thorough documentation of strengths and weaknesses, and provision of an opportunity to express opinions about MFRI. One respondent thought his/her evaluation was adequate.

A few comments were made in response to a question asking if performance evaluation would be helpful and in what form. These comments were similar to those made in response to the previous question. Respondents would like to discuss their performance with their supervisor. One would like the evaluation to be based on the accomplishment of agreed-upon goals.

Most employees (77%) who received positive feedback from their supervisors did so within one week. One reported feedback within a month and one in "another" timeframe. Six employees did not respond to the question.

Negative feedback was also communicated to most employees (65%) within a week, although 24 percent received it in "another" timeframe, and 12 percent in their annual evaluation.

Feedback from supervisors took the following forms, listed in order of frequency.

1. and 2. comments regarding what was done wrong, and general comments
3. and 4. comments regarding what was done well, and informal comments
5. ~~suggestions on how to improve~~
6. written performance evaluation
7. specific comments
8. points related to goals

Asked to describe the key problems facing the unit, faculty/managers cited lack of personnel; inadequate funding; no clear sense of direction; a cold, impersonal atmosphere; low morale; inability of management to change things; poor organizational structure; refusal of units to work together; meeting changes in the field; being viewed as outsiders in relation to the Fire Service; and lack of direction from management resulting in the section developing an identity independent of the Institute. Regional faculty cited lack of necessary personnel; inability to get answers to questions; need to develop an information system; conflicting attitudes and ideas on the part of supervisors; lack of competent leadership and a well-defined work plan; and management and service staff no longer being in touch with field problems and requirements. The support staff believed poor communication and lack of equipment were key problems.

Lack of leadership and direction as well as low morale and poor communications were cited most frequently as the key problems facing MFRI.

Employees also mentioned lack of adequate funding, favoritism toward some employees, no direct voice on Campus, certification and program development, lack of positive reinforcement, surviving the political storm, lack of focus on mission, low field instructor salaries, internal power struggles, and disloyalty to the Director and Associate Director.

Many suggestions were made for improving the performance of MFRI. Most frequently mentioned was the need for people to work together cooperatively. There were several suggestions related to management: change the top leadership, have the Management Council act as a unified body, reduce layers of management, ~~gain support from management, and reorganize management.~~ Other suggestions included: distribute some of the extra work to part-time faculty, prioritize projects, job enrichment, honest promotion and employee evaluation, update and enforce use of procedures manual, and obtain needed equipment.

Asked if a portion of each day/week were set aside for uninterrupted quiet, what area of performance would demonstrate the most immediate improvement, several employees responded that course/instructional development would improve. Other areas that would see improvement were work planning, current assignments, organization of record systems, computer skills, paper work, research, filing of resource material, and reading periodicals. Several employees said there was no lack of time to improve performance.

VI Advancement

The respondents were equally divided on the question of opportunities for advancement, with eight saying there were sufficient opportunities, eight disagreeing, and seven offering no opinion (except comments). Sixty-seven percent of the faculty/management responded positively to the question, forty percent of the regional faculty did so, but none of the support staff made positive responses.

Comments to this item were varied. Relative to classified positions, there were statements that there was no opportunity for advancement. Relative to non-classified positions, there appears to be sentiment that while positions can become available, the "rules" for obtaining those positions change frequently and have not been made clear to current employees. Comments were made that selections of new employees were not always based on ability, but rather on "being liked." One respondent did state that he/she thought that considering the small faculty, there were opportunities for advancement.

Nineteen individuals responded to the question asking what incentives management provided for advancement. Nine respondents stated "none," and one said "very few." Two respondents were uncertain. One classified employee said he/she was encouraged to advance outside of MFRI. Several respondents stated pay as an incentive, particularly for managers, with two respondents believing that high pay for managers came at the expense of faculty. One respondent stated that the only incentive is the "power trip that management people are on," while another suggested that there are many promises, but little support. One specific incentive that was mentioned was permission to attend college on MFRI time.

Many suggestions were made for providing incentives to advance within MFRI. There were several suggestions that MFRI should promote from within, using performance and ability as criteria for promotion. A recommendation was made to establish a system particular to MFRI, not necessarily similar to anything on campus. Consider some type of tenure track. Award higher salaries to individuals with advanced degrees and longer service. Tell staff they're performing well. A respondent suggested that management provide a complete job description for each position and indicate the benefits attached to the position. Money, responsibility and authority should accompany advancement. A suggestion was made to identify strengths and weaknesses

during evaluation. MFRI should assist in career development. Management should have control over their own portion of the budget. Sections should be completely staffed. Develop a team concept and remove the political machine. Not everyone can advance. MFRI needs to reorganize employees who do an effective job of program delivery and relieve them of committee activities which inhibit their ability to achieve results.

Nineteen employees responded to the question asking if positions were filled in a fair and equitable manner. Three respondents thought they probably were. Six respondents said no or never. One respondent believes recent positions have been. There were several comments that filling positions took too long. Some respondents thought ability and performance were not always used to judge candidates. One employee thought search committees, when appointed, have done a good job but internal appointments are suspect. On the other hand, another employee thought promotions should be made by managers, not committees. A regional faculty member complained that promotions from among that group are stopped by an assistant director who has spoken disparagingly about regional faculty. Internal candidates are judged on how well liked they are and whether they'll fit into the click, not on their merits.

VII Problems and Recommendations

Several problems were identified by respondents. Low morale is perceived as being a problem. It was attributed to two sources: (1) lack of recognition of the existence of MFRI by the rest of the College Park Campus, and (2) the "building of individual empires" within MFRI. There is a lack of communication among staff and faculty. There is general feeling of frustration at MFRI, probably the result of ineffective management. Several problems

centered around mangement. Top management was termed "self serving," and as having little respect from faculty. The "top-heavy" management was also described as "unfeeling to the needs of the regions." Managers are neither people oriented nor goal oriented. The constant influence of external political bodies affect the entire organization. High turnover and understaffing lead to an "intense workplace." There is uncertainty about rewards and a lack of concern for employees' health. Finally, the Director was criticized for not sharing important information with the staff and taking actions which result in confusion and concern among the staff.

Many suggestions were offered. Most related to the need for improved management at MFRI, giving the organization a better sense of direction. The management team is not unified and always seems to be in conflict, affecting everyone's performance in one way or another. Someone suggested eliminating the assistant director positions and making the divisions and sections support one another. Management should periodically check with staff to determine if and how well the mission is being met. It was recommended that the evaluation process be used as a vehicle to make the necessary changes in MFRI so it can function effectively as part of UMCP. Give the staff an opportunity to make the required improvements in education/training, research and service. Since MFRI is required to hire and promote faculty with advanced degrees and instructors are certified by the Maryland Higher Education Commission, some sort of credit should be awarded for successful course completion. A suggestion was made that a standardized system for incentive pay be developed and implemented. Such a system should include honest and candid evaluations. There was a recommendation that MFRI be reorganized one more time and a suggestion that MFRI be disbanded and a new organization, or perhaps several county-based organizations, formed to provide fire service training. Finally,

it should be noted that several respondents wanted it known that they hoped the evaluation process would result in positive changes for MFRI because it was a fire organization with good people working in it.

EXECUTIVE STUDY COMMISSION ON THE MARYLAND FIRE AND RESCUE INSTITUTE

Minutes of MFRI Study Commission Meeting
December 13, 1990

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m., with a quorum present. Present were: Robert H. Shimer, Rocco Gabrielle, Leonard King, Laurence Preston, Fred Frederick, Tom Mattingly, Ed Quinn, Steve Cox, Robert DiPietro, Joseph Robison, William Aamos, Ron Milor, and Chuck Sturtz and Brian Darmody.

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

The Chair proceeded to thank the committee on the behalf of the Governor for attending the meetings and reading all the information provided. He noted that this meeting must come to a conclusion.

Chair noted that it was obvious that the Committee would be unable to address all of the decisions. Chair asked the committee to provide models based on their decision of what it is the committee needs to address, how we can address them and provide a model that will be workable, addresses the budget constraints, something that will respond to this issue in a fairly prompt manner.

Chair noted he did not know how the Governor would respond to whatever it is that the Commission gives him.

Brian Darmody proceeded to put on the board those items that need to be addressed in whatever decision we reach.

1. Placement of MFRI
2. Conflicting pressures on Executive Director
3. Visibility of MFRI in budget process
4. Acceptance of regional training centers
5. Improved Mission Statement for MFRI

After considerable discussion by the members of the Commission it was decided that no firm final decision could be reached. The Commission then passed the following motion.

"Motion made to direct Dr. Kirwan to implement changes outlined in the Administrative Review. Commission to request Governor to extend jurisdiction of Commission beyond December 15, 1990 deadline. Commission will

continue to examine organizational models for placement of MFRI as well as other charges outlined in Governor's Executive Order and will review progress of implementation of Administrative Review."

The meeting adjourned was adjourned at 4:00 P.M.